


JPRS-TAC-87-057

296083

18 SEPTEMBER 1987



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report

Arms Control

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

19990114 103

REPRODUCED BY
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
SPRINGFIELD, VA 22161

10
113
A06

18 SEPTEMBER 1987

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI, SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW NEWS Interviews Gen Lebedev on Thule Radar (Vladimir Brodetskiy; Moscow MOSCOW NEWS, No 32, 9 Aug 87)	1
USSR: U.S. Response to Verification 'More Than Reserved' (Viktor Levin; Moscow Domestic Service, 14 Aug 87)	3
PRAVDA Correspondent Reports on SDI Expenditures (V. Sukhoy; Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW, 12 Aug 87)	5
Japan: Text of U.S. Pact on SDI Research (Tokyo KYODO, 22 Jul 87)	8

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR, SPACE ARMS TALKS

USSR's Gerasimov Holds Press Briefing 13 August (Moscow TASS, 13 Aug 87)	10
Comments on Reagan Address	10
Discusses ICBMs' Deployment	10
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Raps Pentagon Plan To 'Demothball' B-53 Bombs (Yu. Borin; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 13 Aug 87)	11
TASS: Work Under Way in All Three Groups (Moscow TASS, 14 Aug 87)	12
USSR: U.S. Senate Delegation in Moscow Discusses Disarmament (Various sources, 17, 20 Aug 87)	13

Talks With Supreme Soviet Group	13
Meets With Bessmertnykh	14
Received by Demichev, Yeltsin	14
Holds News Conference	15
USSR: U.S. Charges on SALT II To 'Complicate' INF Talks (V. Nazarenko; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 19 Aug 87)	16
INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES	
Soviet Comments on Pershing 1-A 'Stumbling Block' (Various sources, various dates)	18
APN Political Analyst, by Spartak Beglov	18
USSR's Responsible Approach, by Ryabtsev	20
U.S. 'Unwillingness', by A. Sisnev	21
Trial of Antiwar Campaigner, by Aleksandr Zholkver	22
Gerasimov Gives Briefing 7 August	23
PRAVDA Deplores U.S., FRG Remarks, by Yuriy Zhukov	24
Moscow Treaty, Missiles	26
Genscher Receives Shevardnadze Letter	27
Genscher Ignores Pershing Issue	27
Karpov on 'Zero-Zero Agreement'	27
FRG-U.S. RAM Complex 'New Twist', by Aleksandr Zholkver	28
USSR: Continued Discussions of Pershing 1-A Issue (Various sources, various dates)	30
U.S. Stance Unjustifiable, by Yuriy Zhukov	30
Fuel FRG Nuclear Ambitions, by V. Katin	32
Moscow TV Commentary, by Aleksandr Bovin	33
FRG Politicians Lack Unanimity	34
U.S., FRG Avoiding Issue	35
Shultz Letter Reported	36
Shultz Letter, U.S. Troop Withdrawal	36
Karpov: Make Decision	37
Arbatov, Moynihan Interviewed	38
TASS Military Writer	39
Gerasimov: U.S. Position 'Illogical,' Gennadiy Gerasimov Interview	41
Soviet Colonel Views U.S. Objections to On-Site Inspections (V. Nazarenko; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 5 Aug 87)	42
Soviet Commentators View INF Prospects, MERDEKA Interview (Vladimir Pasko, et al.; Moscow Domestic Service, 7 Aug 87)	44
USSR's 'International Observers Roundtable' on Arms Talks (Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, et al.; Moscow Domestic Service, 9 Aug 87)	46

Soviet 'International Observers Roundtable' Discusses INF, CW, Verification (Igor Pavlovich Charikov, et al.; Moscow Domestic Service, 16 Aug 87)	52
USSR: West German, Soviet Trade Unions Back Double-Zero (Moscow TRUD, 1 Aug 87)	56
TASS: U.S., FRG Cooperate on RAM System (Moscow TASS, 4 Aug 87)	57
IZVESTIYA: NATO Plans New Nuclear Arms If INF Accord Reached (Moscow IZVESTIYA, 4 Aug 87)	58
Moscow on NATO Plans To 'Upgrade' Arms in Event of INF Deal (Valeriy Korzin; Moscow Television Service, 5 Aug 87)	59
USSR: NATO UK Exercises Sign of Building 'Nuclear Muscle' (A. Maslennikov; Moscow PRAVDA, 11 Aug 87)	60
IZVESTIYA on French Call for Neutron Bombs in FRG (Yu. Kovalenko; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 11 Aug 87)	61
TASS Reports Antiwar Demonstration at FRG Embassy in Moscow (Moscow TASS, 12 Aug 87)	63
USSR's Chervov: U.S. Arms at Misawa 'Threaten' Security (Tokyo KYODO, 16 Aug 87)	64
USSR's Primakov: Reduction Agreement 'Within This Year' (Tokyo KYODO, 12 Aug 87)	65

CHEMICAL, BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

Soviet CD Delegate Nazarkin on Chemical Arms (Paris LE FIGARO, 17 Aug 87; Moscow TASS, 17 Aug 87)	66
New Verification Proposal, Yuriy Nazarkin Interview Confers With French	66 67

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

Shevardnadze CD Speech Stresses Importance of Verification (Enver Mamedov; Moscow APN DAILY REPORT, 10 Aug 87)	68
Soviet CD Delegate on Verifying Test Ban, Space Arms Pacts (Moscow PRAVDA, 14 Aug 87)	71
USSR's Tatarnikov Hits NATO Stance in CSCE (Moscow IZVESTIYA, 29 Jul 87)	72

USSR's Kashlev on Meetings To Follow Vienna CSCE (Oleg Blinov; Moscow Domestic Service, 31 Jul 87)	73
Spanish Press Interview With Gribkov on Defense Policy (Anatoliy Gribkov Interview; Madrid DIARIO 16, 4 Aug 87)	74
NUCLEAR TESTING, FREE ZONE PROPOSALS	
IZVESTIYA Commentator on Asian Security, Testing, Regional NFZ's (V. Matveyev; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 1 Aug 87)	76
TASS: Radiation From U.S. Blasts Has 'Disastrous' Effects (Moscow TASS, 14 Aug 87)	79
Soviet Reaction to Charges of Leaking From 2 August Test (Various sources, various dates)	81
'Insignificant' Leak, No Fallout	81
Gerasimov Raps West on Reports	82
PRAVDA on U.S. 'Disinformation,' by A. Lyutyy	83
Meteorology Chief on Fallout Check	85
Foreign Ministry Press Briefing, by S. Guk	86
Europeans Blame Soviet Test for Higher Radioactivity (Hamburg DPA, 13 Aug 87; Helsinki Domestic Service, 12 Aug 87)	88
FRG Health Ministry Reports	88
Finland Levels 'Almost Normal'	88
Briefs	
TASS on 13 August Nevada Test	89
RELATED ISSUES	
PRAVDA's Korionov Argues 'Bankruptcy' of Nuclear Deterrence (Vitaliy Korionov; Moscow PRAVDA, 31 Jul 87)	90
USSR: Australia's Foreign Minister Proposes Risk-Reduction Measures (Moscow TASS, 18 Aug 87)	93
Mongolian Leader Espouses Asian Security (Zhambyn Batmunkh; Prague WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, No 6, Jun 87)	94
USSR: Mongolia's Foreign Minister Hails Gorbachev Asia Policy (M. Dugersuren; Moscow PRAVDA, 12 Aug 87)	102
USSR: PRK Foreign Minister Views Asian Security Issues (B. Vinogradov; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 11 Aug 87)	105
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Cites PRC Views on Korean Troop Cuts (Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 19 Aug 87)	107

MOSCOW NEWS INTERVIEWS GEN LEBEDEV ON THULE RADAR

PM120943 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 32, 9 Aug 87 p 6

[Interview with Major General Yuriy Lebedev by Vladimir Brodetskiy: "American Cyclops in Greenland"]

[Text] Q.: Instead of five scattered old radar units deployed not far from Thule Greenland, the US has decided to build a basically new radar unit to warn against missile attack, all components of which are concentrated in one place. The main component of the design, as we understand it, is the so called phased grating. What is this and what are the radar's technical abilities?

A.: The principle of operation for any radar installation is to radiate energy into space by means of an aerial, then perceive signals reflected from targets and process them.

Radar units not supplied with phased grating successively move the beam in space within the boundaries of the scanning sector. With this method the unit's capacity, i.e., the speed of processing targets, is not high. For example, for the American BMEWS radar warning system, with speed of space scanning being no more than 30 degrees per second the capacity is no more than ten targets.

In radar units with phased grating, the principle of space scanning is much more improved. Any point of space can be scanned in a millisecond. This is done by means of aerials consisting of numerous components capable of radiating energy with a present phase. The latter receives energy as though combined, taking into account each emitter of the aerial. The whole system is operated by a highly-effective computer.

All this shows that Washington needs to make its ungrounded claims against the Soviet radar installation near Krasnoyarsk to justify its actions and intentions which undermine the ABM Treaty.

Q.: A radar of the Pave Paws-type has been put on combat duty in Thule. A similar "cyclops" is being built in Britain, not far from Fylingdales Moor. It looks as if it is pursuing a far-fetched aim - the creation of an antimissile defence system for the future....

A.: These radars fit very well into the system of such Pave Paws-type units on US territory: Robins, Otis, Beale and Goodfellow bases, including the ABM radar at the Grand Forks base. This radar system creates a radar field over the US and at the approaches to it. This field may also be used to ensure target-to-indication active (strike) ABM components.

Lieutenant-Colonel Miller, chief of the radar station in Thule, told a correspondent of a Danish paper, the new radar unit provides for a high accuracy in detecting missiles and space targets. In other words, it can also ensure with target-indication also weapons developed under the Star Wars programme.

Q.: The Soviet Union has declared that the whole responsibility for the negative consequences of violating the ABM Treaty rested with the United States. Does it mean that the USSR will be compelled to take some retaliatory measures in this field?

A.: I think that it is not a question of retaliatory measures but of US political and moral responsibility.

The Soviet-American permanent ABM Treaty is a crucial agreement in the limitation of strategic armaments. It personifies the organic link between defensive and offensive strategic armaments. Restrictions on the ABM system remove the stimulus for the development of attack systems. But if the ABM Treaty is undermined, impetus will be given to a brand-new round of the arms race, thus pulling the world closer to the brink of holocaust.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1626

SDI, SPACE ARMS

USSR: U.S. RESPONSE TO VERIFICATION 'MORE THAN RESERVED'

LD142120 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 14 Aug 87

[Commentary by Viktor Levin]

[Text] A new Soviet attack on SDI -- this is how DPA characterized the proposal of the Soviet Union to develop [sozdat] a system of international verification on prohibiting deploying [razmeshcheniye] any kind of weapons in space. Here is the latest new commentary by Viktor Levin:

[Levin] Prompted by DPA's reaction, one recalls various expressions, such as if the shoe fits, wear it. Of course, if one looks at the Soviet proposal from the Star Wars standpoint, then it is possible to reach the same conclusion as DPA. But what is interesting is that the same U.S. state figures that advocate implementing the Strategic Defense Initiative, as they call the Star Wars plans, give the assurance that they are against the militarization of space. And so, in view of this fact, the comments by DPA appear, in my view, to be a disservice to Washington.

Let us recall what it is, specifically, that the Soviet Union is proposing. We are posing the question of developing a system of international verification to keep space peaceful. To this end it is proposed to establish an international inspectorate so inspection groups could be constantly present at all test sites for the launching of space objects. In the view of our country, one ought to set about forming a verification system now, without awaiting an agreement on space.

Technically it is not difficult at all to implement what the Soviet Union is proposing. For the time being there are not yet that many space launching sites in the world, and the presence at these of international inspectors would reliably guarantee that objects launched into space are not weapons and are not equipped with any kind of weapons.

By the way, U.S. supporters of SDI assert that the Soviet Union is itself devoting great attention to using space for military purposes, and they, the story goes, are forced to catch up with us. So, in essence, we are inviting international inspectors to our space launching sites, and, I repeat, we are proposing to set about this immediately so they can convince themselves with their own eyes how things stand. If people in the United States really have doubts with respect to our activities, then they ought surely to grasp immediately the proposal of establishing an international inspectorate.

However, reactions across the ocean to this proposal are, I would say, for the time being more than reserved. But the conclusion reached by DPA appears to me to be the first attack on our idea, and an attack quite possibly prompted by the United States.

In general, an interesting situation has recently been developing. At first sight it appears paradoxical. The West for many years affirmed that the problem of verification was an obstacle to effective disarmament measures and said the Soviet Union was against this. Now that our country is advocating verification with the utmost clarity and is going much further than the West in this most important issue, the West disowns verification. But in reality there is nothing paradoxical in this position. There was a time when the West speculated on the problem of verification, but that game will no longer do. And if there was no sincere desire in the West to set about limiting the arms race and disarming, then it appears there is none today. At least this is the conclusion that suggests itself from the reaction to the Soviet proposal to develop a system of international verification to keep space peaceful.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1626

PRAVDA CORRESPONDENT REPORTS ON SDI EXPENDITURES

Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW in English 12 Aug 87 pp 1-4

[Article by PRAVDA Correspondent V. Sukhoy under the rubric "News and Views": "Faust's Alliance With the Devil, Or What the Star Wars Advocates in the USA Are Doing Now"]

[Text] The past two years were not easy for the SDI advocates. As many as 6,500 American scientists and researchers--people without whose knowledge creation of an anti-missile defence system with space-based elements is unthinkable--have declared against appropriation of funds for SDI. They hold the view that such system is too expensive and ineffective.

Peter Hart Research Associates company specialising in public opinion polls asked 6,549 leading American physicists to express their views on the Star Wars. As many as 75 per cent of them voiced serious doubts in SDI's ability to protect the Americans from ballistic missiles while 62 per cent of those polled declared against deployment of any military system in space. The company published the results of the poll while the Federation of American Scientists and the Union of Concerned Scientists made them widely known.

The U.S. legislators could not ignore the arguments of the scientists and experts. They began to pursue a line of reducing the expenditures earmarked for the Star Wars programme. For instance, the Administration asked Congress to appropriate 5.4 billion dollars for the research work relating to the implementation of the SDI programme in the current fiscal year of 1987 but received approximately 3.5 billion. The White House asked Congress to allocate an even greater sum, 5.7 billion dollars, for the work in the field of Strategic Defense Initiative during the next fiscal year of 1988 but the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress voted to appropriate 3.1 billion dollars for these purposes. Since the Senate which has not taken such an irreconcilable stand had earlier voted for the allocation of 4.5 billion dollars the final sum will be now fixed by the House-Senate Conference Committee. Presumably, the sum will be about 3.7 billion dollars, i.e., 2 billion dollars less than the President has asked.

In this situation the pushers of the Star Wars resort to a new tactic. They claim that the opponents of SDI "distort" the essence of the programme, reducing it to the most exotic technology--X-ray lasers and beams of directed particles.

Robert Jastrow, the founder and former director of the Goddard Institute under NASA and a well-known advocate of SDI, classes the so-called kinetic missile-killers and the rail gun as "ready technology."

Representative Jack Kemp (N.Y.), a Republican hopeful at the next presidential election, vehemently advocates a go-ahead with the first stage of SDI in five to seven years. Kemp's reasoning is based on the conclusions of Robert Jastrow and the George Marshall Institute, a conservative organization that works out recommendations for the ways of using modern technologies for military purposes. Making it clear that the Star Wars is an important issue of his election campaign, Kemp introduced in the House a special amendment which provides the creation of one of the SDI systems as early as 1993.

The arguments of Kemp and the others who think like him are very simple. Deploying the first phase of SDI, they allege, will cost around 124,000 million dollars, which is far below the recent Congressional allocations for housing construction and highways maintenance. As a result, however, they go on, America will have an ABM system which will reliably protect its ballistic missiles launching pads and command centers. A "steel wall" of numerous metal pins that will be flying around each installation as a swarm of bees at a tremendous speed is to encircle these facilities. These kinetic weapons are to destroy enemy missiles by piercing through them at high speed, rather than blowing them up.

The metal pins will be set in motion at such high speed by electromagnetic guns. An electromagnetic gun is an electric engine with two rails that form the gun's "barrel." An intensive electromagnetic field that forms between the two rails under the influence of a high voltage electric current is capable of imparting a truly fantastic speed to any projectile.

About 234 million dollars were allocated for the development of kinetic armaments in the 1987 fiscal year. The figure will go up to 303.5 million in 1988 and to 357.4 million in 1989.

At the initial stage kinetic weapons are to be deployed in space on board specially equipped satellites. Later such weapons are to be deployed on land-based ABM systems which have been code-named HEDI and ERIS. The two systems were tested last year, and more systems are to be tested again at the end of this summer.

Do the lately more frequent expatiations on the priority of kinetic arms mean that the remaining aspects of the Star Wars programme have been neglected? Of course, not. The fact that the development of kinetic weapons has swallowed up a mere 234 million of the 3,500 million dollars allocated for SDI in the current fiscal year speaks for itself.

One may be absolutely sure that the enormous Nova laser installation built at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory at the cost of 187 million dollars is not standing idle. The contractor companies involved in implementing the Star Wars programme, the number of which has now exceeded 1,300, have not been sitting twiddling their thumbs, either. Boeing Corporation, which has received from the Strategic Defense Initiative Organization orders worth 131 million dollars, seized leadership among them in 1986. It is followed by TRW concern (61 million), Hughes Aircraft Corporation (40 million), Lockheed (25 million), and Rockwell International Corp. (24 million dollars). The activities of the arms manufacturing companies have affected the American tax-payers, too, each of whom had to part with 13 dollars for the SDI programme in 1986 alone.

There were 57 Nobel Prize-winners among the American scientists who signed the Appeal for Outlawing Space Arms. One of them has described the Star Wars programme as "Faust's alliance with the devil." A very apt and precise comparison.

(Pravda, August 12. Abridged.)

/8309

CSO: 5200/1626

JAPAN: TEXT OF U.S. PACT ON SDI RESEARCH

OW220059 Tokyo KYODO in English 0041 GMT 22 Jul 87

[Text] Washington, July 21 KYODO -- The final text of the Japan-U.S. agreement on the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) signed in Washington Tuesday is as follows:

The Government of Japan and the Government of the United States of America,

Desiring to provide the basis for Japanese participation, in response to the invitation by the secretary of defense of the United States of America of March 27, 1985 and based upon the views expressed in the statement of the chief cabinet secretary of Japan of September 9, 1986, in research in the Strategic Defense Initiative, which aims at enhancing stability and deterrence being carried out by the government of the United States of America,

Have agreed as follows.

1. It is the intention of both governments to facilitate participation by entities of Japan on the basis of equitable and genuine competition.
2. Subject to compliance with applicable laws, regulations and international obligations of each government, the Government of Japan and the Government of the United States of America will endeavor to permit entities of Japan and the United States of America who wish to participate in research in the Strategic Defense Initiative to compete on equal terms for contracts awarded within the scope of this agreement.
3. In order that classified information, furnished for or generated in the performance of work pursuant to specific contractual arrangements for research in the Strategic Defense Initiative (hereinafter referred to as "specific contractual arrangements"), be protected, both governments will take all necessary and appropriate measures within the framework of domestic laws of each country and agreements between Japan and the United States of America.
4. Fair and equitable treatment will be accorded to information generated by entities of Japan and the United States of America in the performance of work pursuant to specific contractual arrangements, as well as to information generated by them prior to or independently from such contractual performance.

5. Concerning the transfer of information related to the work pursuant to specific contractual arrangements, the Government of Japan and the Government of the United States of America will draw upon the mutual defense assistance agreement between Japan and the United States of America, signed at Tokyo on March 8, 1954, as appropriate, and this agreement.

6. Arrangements necessary to implement this agreement will be agreed upon between the competent authorities of both governments. This agreement as implemented by these arrangements will constitute the basis for Japanese participation in research in the Strategic Defense Initiative.

7. This agreement will be implemented in accordance with applicable laws, regulations and international obligations of each governments, including, for the government of the United States of America, those assumed under the treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the limitation of anti-ballistic missile systems, signed at Moscow on May 26, 1972, and for both governments, those assumed under the Charter of the United Nations.

8. The two governments will, upon the request of either of them, consult regarding any matter relating to the implementation of this agreement.

9. This agreement will enter into force on signature and will remain in force until six months after the date of the receipt of notice of termination by either government.

/9604

CSO: 5260/121

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR, SPACE ARMS TALKS

USSR'S GERASIMOV HOLDS PRESS BRIEFING 13 AUGUST

Comments on Reagan Address

LD131610 Moscow TASS in English 1544 GMT 13 Aug 87

[Excerpt] Moscow August 13 TASS--"A coincidence of forecasts and hopes is being noted in Moscow," Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, said at a briefing at the ministry's press centre today in connection with U.S. President Ronald Reagan's broadcast to the nation on Wednesday.

In the broadcast the President had voiced hope that a comprehensive and verifiable agreement with the Soviet Union on cutbacks in nuclear arms would be reached in the coming months, and had pointed out real progress in the issue concerning global elimination of a whole class of nuclear arms, meaning medium-range missiles.

"It is desirable," Gennadiy Gerasimov pointed out, "that there be also a coincidence of approaches so that the two sides would really seek to attain the goal without attempts to somehow circumvent agreement or to 'outpoint' the other side."

Discusses ICBMs' Deployment

LD131337 Moscow TASS in English 1327 GMT 13 Aug 87

[Text] Moscow August 13 TASS -- The deployment of launchers of Soviet mobile missiles is taking place in full conformity with the Soviet Union's existing international commitments, including the provisions of the SALT-2 and SALT-1 treaties, it was stated by Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Speaking today at a briefing at the Foreign Ministry's Press Centre he noted that the launchers of mobile land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles in their railroad variant ensure the enhanced survivability of Soviet strategic forces and in the obtaining situation contribute to the preservation of strategic stability in the world.

The Soviet side stressed that simultaneously with the deployment of launchers of mobile missiles the USSR has substantially reduced the number of launchers of MIRVED intercontinental ballistic missiles of another type of basing, the Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said.

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR, SPACE ARMS TALKS

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA RAPS PENTAGON PLAN TO 'DEMOTHBALL' B-53 BOMBS

PM141749 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Aug 87 First Edition p 3

["Rejoinder" by Lieutenant Colonel Yu. Borin: "Removing From the Old Vaults..."]

[Text] A piece of alarming news has spread around the world press: The U.S. Defense Department has informed Congress that it is starting to demothball the extremely powerful B-53 nuclear aerial bombs, which will become strategic offensive arms. As specialists comment, it is the Pentagon's plan that such aerial bombs should make up for the decommissioned Titan-2 ICBM's, which have virtually the same charge.

The time chosen to make the U.S. military department's decision public is not fortuitous. The USSR's historic proposal of 15 January 1986 to eliminate nuclear and other kinds of weapons of mass destruction by the year 2000 opened up for mankind the way to a world without wars. The peoples of all countries have given the broadest welcome to the latest Soviet peace initiatives -- the "global double-zero option" or medium-range and operational and tactical missiles and the halving of U.S. and Soviet strategic nuclear armaments accompanied by strengthening of the ABM Treaty. The ruling circles of Western countries and above all the United States did not dare this time to reject the Soviet Union's constructive new proposals "out of hand." But they did prove incapable of adopting them, hampered by the blinders of militarist thinking. Therefore, while continuing to proclaim at every political forum their commitment to the cause of nuclear disarmament, they seek to hamper and, if possible, thwart the Soviet Union's peace offensive.

The Pentagon's decision must be seen in this light. It was taken with the provocative aim of provoking the Soviet Union to take a similar step -- not reducing but, on the contrary, increasing its nuclear arsenal. If you follow the transatlantic strategists' militarist logic, the increase ought to be a very large one, since the old aerial bombs -- up to 10 megatons each -- which the Pentagon has announced its intention to "demothball" are substantially higher in their yield than all other charges in the present U.S. arsenal. The stocks of these lethal weapons in the United States, judging by all the U.S. press reports, are considerable. The creation of stocks of B-53 aerial bombs, for example, made it possible for the Pentagon back in 1969-1970 to replace and decommission three other types of nuclear munitions.

In other words, the U.S. military and political leadership's dangerous manipulations with the B-53 bombs have again graphically illustrated to the whole world its stubborn desire to pursue a policy that is in no way aimed at preventing nuclear catastrophe. The megaton aerial bombs are not designed for any sort of defensive purpose. They can only serve aggressive purposes.

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR, SPACE ARMS TALKS

TASS: WORK UNDER WAY IN ALL THREE GROUPS

LD141916 Moscow TASS in English 1912 GMT 14 Aug 87

[Text] Geneva August 14 TASS -- In the past week work was underway in all three groups to the Soviet-American negotiations on nuclear and space armaments -- on medium-range, space and strategic offensive armaments. The discussion is centered on the new Soviet proposals on the medium range -- shorter range missile problem, providing for double global zero solution on these armaments of the USSR and USA and also draft agreements submitted by the Soviet side on some measures to consolidate the ABM Treaty regime and to prevent the arms race from spreading to outer space and the treaty on strategic offensive armaments which embodies the principle of 50-per cent reduction of strategic offensive armaments of the sides.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1627

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR, SPACE ARMS TALKS

USSR: U.S. SENATE DELEGATION IN MOSCOW DISCUSSES DISARMAMENT

Talks With Supreme Soviet Group

LD171656 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1545 GMT 17 Aug 87

[Excerpts] Moscow, 17 Aug (TASS)--Ways to improve Soviet-U.S. relations and questions of disarmament and the search for ways to reduce international tension were at the heart of a conversation in the Kremlin today between USSR Supreme Soviet delegates and delegates from the U.S. Senate.

The delegation, headed by Senator Daniel Moynihan, arrived in Moscow yesterday on a official visit at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Leningrad as well as Moscow is on the agenda of the Americans' week-long visit.

Lev Tolkunov, chairman of the Council of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet, reminded the senators of the series of Soviet peace initiatives aimed at averting the arms race in space, at eliminating medium-range missiles in Europe and reducing strategic offensive weapons. Moreover, it was underlined that the Soviet side holds the view that strict verification [kontrol] of observance of adopted agreements be introduced. The USSR Supreme Soviet deputies noted the important role of developing bilateral mutually beneficial trade in the improvement of Soviet-U.S. relations. On this question, however, the Senate holds a negative position. In recent times the Senate has adopted a number of amendments to the legislation that are hostile in nature.

Regarding the state of relations between the two countries, Senator Terry Sanford pointed to the need to increase the exchange of delegations between the two countries not only at the official level but also by widening the visits of ordinary citizens. This is the way toward better mutual understanding, the guest emphasized.

At the same time, the senator accused the Soviet Union of interference in the affairs of Afghanistan. He tried to justify the implementation of SDI by claiming that the research in this field need not necessarily be used for unleashing "Star Wars."

Both sides admitted that an agreement on eliminating medium-range missiles in Europe must become the first step in solving the historical question of disarmament.

Meets With Bessmertnykh

LD171845 Moscow TASS in English 1809 GMT 17 Aug 87

[Text] Moscow August 17 TASS -- Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR Aleksandr Bessmertnykh today had a conversation with a delegation of the U.S. Senate.

Prospects of reaching accords on limiting and reducing nuclear-missile arms, including the elimination of medium-range and shorter-range missiles on a global scale, as well as questions of interaction in solving regional problems and developing bilateral Soviet-American relations in the trade, economic, humanitarian and other fields were discussed.

Received by Demichev, Yeltsin

PM200930 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Aug 87 Second Edition p 4

[Excerpts] Petr Demichev, alternate member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and first vice president of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, received the U.S. Senate delegation led by Senator Daniel Moynihan in the Kremlin today.

During the conversation, there was an exchange of views on matters concerning bilateral relations as well as on a number of topical international issues.

They declared for continuing and expanding the two countries' dialogue, and for search for ways to resolve disputes by means of talks.

The two sides were unanimous in recognising the historic importance of concluding an agreement on eliminating medium-range missiles in Europe.

They considered it necessary to conduct talks on reducing strategic offensive arms, nuclear weapons, and other types of weapons.

On the same day the U.S. Senate delegation was received by Boris Yeltsin, alternate member of the CPSU Central Committee Political Bureau first secretary of the Moscow gorkom, and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Some international issues as well as matters concerning Soviet-U.S. relations were touched upon during the conversation, which was held in a businesslike and frank atmosphere.

Speaking of the Soviet Union's latest foreign policy initiatives, Boris Yeltsin emphasized that they were predetermined by the very nature of Soviet society and by its goal of ensuring a durable, nuclear-free world and security for all peoples.

J.F. Matlock, U.S. ambassador to the USSR, took part in the conversations.

Hold News Conference

LD200914 Moscow TASS in English 0900 GMT 20 Aug 87

[Excerpts] Moscow August 20 TASS--Addressing a news conference in Moscow today, Sen. Daniel Moynihan (Dem. New York) who heads a Senate delegation currently visiting the U.S.S.R., said that the senators were satisfied with the results of the visit.

The American senators said it was important to develop Soviet-American relations on which must [as printed] depended in the present-day world. They advocated a continuing and expanded dialogue between the two countries and a search for a negotiated settlement of disputes.

It was stressed that the conclusion of an agreement on the abolition of medium-range missiles in Europe would be an event of historic importance.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1627

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR, SPACE ARMS TALKS

USSR: U.S. CHARGES ON SALT II TO 'COMPLICATE' INF TALKS

PM191138 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 19 Aug 87 First Edition p 3

[Article by Colonel V. Nazarenko; candidate of military science: "Washington's Diversionary Maneuvers. Soviet SS-24 Missiles: Truth and Fabrications"]

[Text] The prospect of concluding a Soviet-U.S. agreement on eliminating two classes of nuclear missile systems (medium-range missiles and operational and tactical missiles) and their nuclear warheads on a global scale is emerging ever more clearly. However, the closer the possibility of such an agreement, the more activity is displayed by its opponents, of whom there are many in the West, especially across the sea. Now they have decided to start a new campaign to discredit the USSR, trying to prove that you cannot negotiate with the Soviet Union because it is always violating the commitments it has made.

And that is what they did. They started declaring loudly that the Soviet Union, by means of deploying its new SS-24 ICBM's and SLBM's, has exceeded the limitations established by the 1979 SALT II treaty. These are the slanderous fabrications that are heard increasingly frequently in speeches by certain high-ranking Western military figures and politicians.

The Soviet Union makes no secret of the fact that it is modernizing its strategic offensive arms: Obsolete stationary silo-based launchers are being replaced with mobile ones. The Soviet SS-24 is a new type of ICBM whose creation is permitted by the SALT II treaty. Its deployment is taking place within the limits permitted by the treaty. Let us recall that the USSR is permitted 820 ICBM launchers equipped with multiple reentry vehicles (MRV's). The number of missiles of this class presently in existence does not exceed this limit. The Soviet Union, as is known, may have a total of 1,200 ICBM and SLBM launchers with MRV's. At present this total is lower.

Western press commentaries note that the main aim of the new Soviet missile systems adoption is to ensure the invulnerability of the USSR's strategic forces in the event of a surprise strike by the enemy. Here it is particularly emphasized that the concept of mobility of ICBM's is seen, even by a number of military theorists, as a stabilizing factor, robbing the other side of the hope for success in a first, "disarming" strike.

Indeed, replacing stationary ICBM's with mobile ones is above all intended to increase the survivability of the Soviet retaliatory strike forces. Their destruction by a first strike is made substantially more difficult or becomes entirely impossible. This therefore promotes the strengthening of strategic stability.

An analysis of Western publications shows that in the most conservative circles, especially among the U.S. military-political leadership, an active quest is under way for methods for using the deployment of SS-24 ICBM's to accuse the USSR of actions complicating Soviet-U.S. talks on eliminating medium-range missiles and operational and tactical missiles, and strategic arms reduction, as well as whipping up the arms race. It is thus pointed out, citing certain intelligence sources, that the USSR has supposedly already secretly deployed "an unspecified number of SS-24 missiles" in numerous tunnels and camouflaged railroad installations. "Facts" are even cited to the effect that the launchers on railroad flatcars for the new Soviet missiles have the technical potential for rapid reloading and therefore possess significantly greater combat capabilities than was formerly supposed.

Let us say frankly state that the assertions by various kinds of "specialists" who have filled the Western mass media with "facts" concerning the growing Soviet missile threat are not original. A year ago the White House, declaring its refusal to comply with the SALT II treaty in the future, made a clumsy attempt to make it appear the Soviet Union had already violated that treaty by introducing its new ICBM's into the fighting strength. The Administration's purpose was clear. At that time the United States had already begun work on creating a second new ICBM, the Midgetman, that incidentally, did not in any way fit into the SALT II treaty framework. This is because the first new ICBM, the MX, had already been introduced into the fighting strength of the U.S. strategic forces. The quota was exhausted, so the latest new ICBM was "not written in" to the treaty provisions. Preparing the ground for renouncing commitments to comply with the accord in the sphere of strategic offensive arms limitation, Washington attempted to "shift the blame" to the Soviet Union. However, as is known, nothing came of this.

The unpredictability of the subterfuges and diversionary maneuvers by Washington and its most loyal NATO partners cannot but cause concern. Today they have begun a new propaganda offensive with a view to discrediting the Soviet proposals on the "global double zero." Their idle fabrications have nothing to do with reality. The Soviet Union conscientiously fulfills all its international commitments, including those under the SALT II treaty. Incidentally, it was not the USSR but the United States that, back in May 1986, renounced compliance with the limitations the SALT II treaty and in November of that year exceeded the limits set by it. Now the Americans are trying to confuse the issue by releasing all kinds of "canards."

Yes, Washington knows how to ignore the facts; many examples of this could be cited. For instance, the USSR's principled stand on the verification problem is known there. The Soviet side favors verification means ensuring absolute confidence that armaments are indeed being eliminated, and that commitments regarding the remaining arms and the permitted military activity are observed and bans are not circumvented. Not in words, but in deeds. Therefore, the Soviet Union has proposed a whole range of forms and means of verification. One wonders: Who is it who is still "considering" and "thinking about" adopting these as guidance within the framework of the nearly drawn-up agreement on medium-range and operational and tactical missiles? It is necessary to stop shifting the blame and deliberately fanning the smoldering coals of confrontation.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1627

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

SOVIET COMMENTS ON PERSHING 1-A 'STUMBLING BLOCK'

APN Political Analyst

Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW in English 22 Jul 87 pp 1-3

[Article by APN Political Analyst Spartak Beglov under the rubric "News and Views": "Talks in Geneva: The Stake is Greater Than the Missiles"]

[Text] "The Soviet Union has lost interest in the Geneva talks," the Western media say in unison. But is everything so simple?

In reply I would recommend once again asking the question: What is the explanation for the fact that for each step towards agreement in Geneva NATO's influential military and political leaders demand ever more loudly and openly new and new "compensations" in other kinds of nuclear weapons? I have the impression that the leadership of the biggest NATO countries are finding it increasingly difficult to resolve the contradiction between wide public expectations of agreement with the Soviet Union and the striving of conservative politicians at all costs to retain as many nuclear trumps as possible in their power game against the USSR and its allies.

The trick with the West German Pershing-1 A missiles is most indicative in this sense. Powerful propaganda media of the West have been brought into action to present matters as though the attempt on these weapons of the "third country," that is, a country not participating in the negotiations, is the main obstacle on the road to agreement. But the West German Pershings are not at all the subject of the Geneva talks. The artificially inflated ballyhoo around them was needed only to include in the category of "a third country's weapons" 72 nuclear warheads that belong to the Americans. And to no one else. They are therefore subject to reduction in accordance with the "double zero option" logic.

The whole point is that the "double zero" has clashed with the "double standard" in Western policy. Such is the true background to the thing.

British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, during her recent lightning visit to Washington, conceded that the historic changes in the Soviet Union were giving the West a chance that must not be missed. She might have helped here to clear the road to agreement in Geneva. But she again put the main emphasis on the vital necessity of retaining the nuclear factor. And this means that the best chances in London's policy are still the bombs.

During the same days Foreign Minister of the FRG Hans-Dietrich Genscher, speaking in Sophia, urged the abandonment of the old and obsolete stereotypes and called for being guided by categories of new thinking, for stopping viewing East-West relations through the prism of the military aspect alone. Here one can agree with every word. This is why the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, in evaluating the results of the visit to the USSR by Federal President Richard von Weizsacker, expressed the just hope that the FRG government would not hinder the process of liberating the European continent from medium and shorter range nuclear missiles.

But already during the visit by the Federal President to Moscow and immediately after its conclusion, Horst Teltschik, a foreign affairs adviser to the FRG Chancellor, and Manfred Woerner, Minister of Defence, performed a duet on the directly opposite theme: the Soviet restructuring does not mean that the USSR has renounced an "offensive military strategy." Hence the rearmament of the West and nuclear missiles must be given first priority. Whose voice in Bonn is the decisive one?

The stake is greater than missiles. Chancellor Kohl is being intimidated that if the FRG cedes on the question that links together Pershing-1 A missiles and American nuclear warheads, he will lose the support of hardliners. He is threatened that power in West Germany would return to detente supporters. Here is the rub.

A similar situation faced President Reagan when, on the eve of his meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev in Geneva, he came up against the ultimatum presented on behalf of the Pentagon by Caspar Weinberger: the rearmament of the U.S.A. should not be undermined. The same was the case after the meeting in Reykjavik when hardliners in Washington sounded the retreat to nuclear disarmament, and the President, as a result, was left with the only questionable "achievement" on his hands--Irangate. Would it not be better for Washington's NATO partners to help it get out of this chaos and unpredictable power politics by means of a good agreement in Geneva, rather than hide the nuclear warheads in one's bosom?

If an agreement on Euromissiles is likened to a locomotive, then it has ready for it a train of new understandings, new acts of cooperation between East and West. But the conservatives feel shocked at a mere thought about new detente. That would mean the first step towards saying good-bye not only to the Bomb, but also to the habitual and convenient policy of confrontation. In a hurry to plant mines in the form of "ideological incompatibility" and "growing Soviet aggressiveness" stereotypes on this road, they would also like to derail the train, too.

I don't think it will be an exaggeration to say that the Geneva talks are deciding not only the destiny of real disarmament measures. They also determine a general political climate for the future. And not only in West-East relations. The new wave of detente has not yet gained momentum, but the conservatives are already demanding revenge for it. Both in the form of converting medium-range nuclear systems to sea and air basing modes. And in the form of new reprisals against Nicaragua, Cuba, Angola and other countries. Against everybody and everything that embodies the new political realities.

The old way of thinking and acting still makes its stake on a military solution, while in Geneva and at other negotiations going on in the world the stake, I repeat, is much higher than the missiles.

USSR's Responsible Approach

Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW in English 27 Jul 87 pp 1-3

[Article by APN Political Analyst Ryabtsev under the rubric "News and Views": "Soviet Union Demonstrates Responsible Approach"]

[Text] Mikhail Gorbachev's latest proposals on the complete elimination of Soviet and American medium- and shorter-range nuclear missiles open the way for the double zero principle to be implemented worldwide. According to a representative of the Soviet delegation at the Geneva negotiations on nuclear and space arms, all artificial obstacles the American side has piled will disappear once those proposals are accepted.

Thus, the world faces its first-ever tangible opportunity to start stage-by-stage destruction of nuclear arsenals. The Soviet Union and the United States must make the first step. The Soviet leadership declares that its goal is to clean our planet of all nuclear weaponry within this century to save it once and for all from nuclear suicide.

The latest Soviet step showed once again that Moscow upholds the principle of equal security in Europe and Asia as it speaks for the global double zero. The concept of all-embracing international security, with nukes elimination as key component, inspires the Soviet Union in its action. So when the Geneva conferees reach an understanding on destroying American and Soviet medium- and shorter-range missiles all over the world, they will make tremendous headway toward that goal.

The new concept of the world, as proposed by Mikhail Gorbachev, presupposes not only nuclear weaponry but all violence rejected. In particular, the Soviet leader advanced the idea to reduce conventional arsenals and armed forces to keep them within reasonable limits ruling out the chance of a surprise attack. That idea is meant to guarantee dependable security and preclude aggression in any form.

As it evaluates the Soviet leader's latest proposals, the U.S. Administration agrees that the Soviet Union has made an important step forward. But the impression persists that the United States is still determined to achieve superiority at all cost as it seeks to preserve its 72 nuclear warheads for West Germany's Pershing-1A missiles. Washington still thinks that Moscow must close her eyes to them.

But equality and reciprocity are out of the question if we do that. Naturally, the Soviet Union sees the U.S. stance as non-constructive and an obstacle to the entire global double zero effort. To remake missiles is out of the question: it is only possible to destroy them, said Y. Vorontsov, First Deputy Minister

of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, at a Moscow press conference. His statement also concerns American nuclear warheads for West German Pershing-1A missiles.

That stance is just and responsible in its confirmation of equal security. It aims to build on mutual confidence. Moscow sincerely means to put an end to nuclear confrontation, as Mikhail Gorbachev's proposals show once again. The world community supports the Soviet Union with determination.

Naturally, humanity expects the United States to meet the Soviet Union halfway. Otherwise, Moscow and the world will have every reason to say that Washington and Bonn are out to thwart nuclear disarmament as they cling to the 72 Pershing-1A nuclear warheads.

U.S. 'Unwillingness'

PM060949 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 2 Aug 87 Second Edition p 5

[A. Sisnev article: "Arms Control: New Hopes and Old Fears"]

[Text] Moscow and Washington have announced that a meeting will take place in the U.S. capital in mid-September between E.A. Shevardnadze, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR minister of foreign affairs, and U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz.

Commenting on this meeting, U.S. State Department Spokesman Charles Redman stated to journalists that it "will provide an opportunity for us to examine the whole spectrum of questions on our agenda, which consists of four parts: human rights, arms control, regional problems, and bilateral relations. Much work is being done in many of these spheres. We expect the ministers to examine the results of this work and assess promising areas for further progress."

In the opinion of CBS TV, the meeting between the Soviet foreign minister and the U.S. secretary of state "will be of decisive importance to the final preparation of an arms control agreement between the United States and the USSR (the reference is to the talks on medium-range missiles -- author's note), and also of a summit between R. Reagan and M.S. Gorbachev.

However, hopes are clouded by alarm at the U.S. Administrations' unwillingness to remove the main obstacle to progress at the talks on medium-range missiles. UPI, underlining that the superpowers are very near to an agreement on medium-range missiles, at the same time notes that "two unsolved problems remain: The U.S. nuclear warheads in West Germany for short-range missiles (Pershing-1A) and the methods for monitoring the agreement." The agency adds that the administration "refuses point-blank to meet the Soviet Union's demand that the United States eliminate the warheads for these missiles." This is prompting protests, including among specialists. Thus R. Forsberg, well known U.S. scientist and director of the Institute for Defense and Disarmament Studies, said of the recent Soviet initiatives: "This step facilitates the solution of problems in verification that right-wing circles in the United States love to cite." Concerning the question of the 72 Pershing-1A missiles the FRG Government is endeavoring to retain, R. Forsberg pointed out: "I do not see any reasons to prevent them from eliminating these missiles."

You get the impression that the more real the likelihood of reaching an accord between the USSR and the United States becomes, the more rigid and less flexible the U.S. side's positions become, obviously under the influence of certain influential political circles in the United States. In insisting on retaining the nuclear warheads for the Pershing-1A missiles, Washington is effectively rejecting the proposal envisaging a "double-zero" with respect to medium-range and operation and tactical missiles. The question arises: Why then does the Soviet Union not have the right to have a counterbalance to these missiles in Europe? The question of monitoring and verification is also an acute one. The Soviet Union favors on-site verification so that each side is sure of the observance of the treaty. The United States pays lip service to this position, but at the same time puts forward a number of provisos, which mean effectively one thing: limiting access to the U.S. nuclear means subject to elimination.

The aforementioned statement by the State Department spokesman regarding the upcoming meeting between the Soviet foreign minister and the U.S. secretary of state noted that "considerable progress has been made in Geneva on the question of medium-range missiles." The State Department spokesman affirmed that the United States "would like to preserve the momentum of these talks." However, the U.S. side's current position forces us to doubt the sincerity of such assertions.

Trial of Antiwar Campaigner

LD061756 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 6 Aug 87

[Aleksandr Zholkver commentary]

[Text] [Announcer] The trial of participants in the picketing of the U.S. missile base in Mutlangen has come to an end in an FRG court. This "Latest News" commentary is from our Political Observer Aleksandr Zholkver:

[Zholkver] This latest trial in the FRG is notable in many respects: above all, in the fact that the defendants were antiwar activists. This is clearly not in keeping with statements by leaders of the Bonn government to the effect that they, allegedly, also support disarmament, or at any rate that they support everyone's right to express an opinion. But it is by no means just a matter of moral principles. It is a matter of politics, or, if you like, of big-time politics. After all, what is actually going on? Throughout the world, and in West Germany itself, there is broad discussion of ways and opportunities for disarmament. On the eve of Hiroshima Day, the demand that barbaric nuclear weapons should be banned and destroyed is ringing out particularly strongly across all continents. Everyone acknowledges that the new Soviet initiatives have created the most favorable prospects for achieving this. And what are the employees of the FRG's Themis [Greek goddess of wisdom] up to in the meantime? They are passing judgment on those who campaign for nuclear disarmament not in word but in deed.

Perhaps the most noteworthy thing of all is that there were 20 West German judges among the pickets at the U.S. missile base. One of them, (Mathias Weinert), has now been fined DM2,000 by his own colleagues -- DM1,000 for each hour of picketing. It seems to me, however, that it is far from being just a matter of such a heavy fine. Much more alarming is the fact that the FRG judicial authorities are evidently striving to create a precedent and to show that they are ready to take the most extreme measures, even against their own colleagues, in order to suppress the antiwar movement and above all

the antinuclear movement. This enhanced judicial activity is clearly due to the fact that the FRG Government, as you know, is stubbornly campaigning to keep the Pershing-1A missiles and their U.S. nuclear warheads in West Germany.

In this connection, one simply must pay tribute to the courage and farsightedness of that same (Mathias Weinert) when he stated at the trial: Nuclear weapons hold the whole of mankind hostage, and campaigning against this madness is an act of self-preservation.

Gerasimov Gives Briefing 7 August

LD071332 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1252 GMT 7 Aug 87

[Text] Moscow, 7 Aug (TASS) -- Speaking at a briefing here today, USSR Foreign Ministry Spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov expressed regret that in the West the viewpoint has become established that the Geneva talks are a sort of trial of strength where the aim is to outplay the opponent. Thus, according to the British SUNDAY TIMES the United States has for a long time compared these talks with a game of chess. In my view, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman said, such a comparison is not only inaccurate but is also essentially damaging. In a game of chess each side has its own interest: To put the king in checkmate. The interests of the sides in that case are strictly opposed to each other. But in the Soviet-U.S. talks on eliminating missiles, where is this king that must be put in checkmate? The Geneva talks are being conducted in order to coordinate interests and to find a mutually acceptable solution to the problem. To proceed from the gladiatorial spirit of chess here, to see only one's own interests, and to ignore the interests of one's partner means to deny the very essence of the talks.

However, competitive thinking continues to dominate in the U.S. position, and the United States is striving to outplay the Soviet side by keeping 72 U.S. warheads on West German missiles. People in the West are writing that these 72 warheads have become a stumbling block at the talks. Rather they are a touchstone of the sincerity of Washington's intentions. It is time that the U.S. side gave up the habit of trying to outplay its partner, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman stressed. Matters should be directed, using sporting terminology, toward a draw, toward a zero on medium-range missiles and on operational and tactical missiles, and further toward a zero on chemical weapons, on space weapons, and so on, up to a zero on nuclear arsenals altogether. Here Eduard Shevardnadze's speech in Geneva opens up new possibilities.

PRAVDA Deplores U.S., FRG Remarks

PM081849 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Aug 87 Second Edition p 4

["Political Observer's Notes" by Yuriy Zhukov: "Vicious Circle?"]

[Text] As was to be expected, USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze's speech at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva immediately prompted widespread reaction. Many people everywhere are encouraged by the consistency and vigor with which the Soviet Union is pursuing the course of eliminating nuclear and chemical weapons and also of reducing so-called "conventional" arms. But my primary concern is how Bonn and Washington have reacted. After all, the questions raised by our minister were directly addressed to them. So how have they reacted?

On the one hand, a White House spokesman immediately declared that the Soviet foreign minister's speech "inspires us with some optimism." "We believe," he said, "we have reason to hope an agreement will be reached."

On the other hand, he immediately found it necessary to declare that the United States still refuses to eliminate the 72 warheads stationed in the FRG and intended for the Pershing 1-A missiles in the possession of the Bundeswehr.

The speech by M. Kampelman, head of the U.S. delegation at the Geneva talks, on U.S. television sounded equally contradictory. He began by stating that the United States is "very glad" that the "Russians" have taken "a very important step forward," but then he said:

"I quite understand West Germany's position. However, we are not negotiating on its behalf. We can speak only for ourselves..."

"But we control the warheads for these missiles!" a journalist objected.

"If we deprived them of these warheads," M. Kampelman said imperturbably, "we would be violating an agreement with our allies..."

Really! You might think the White House had forgotten that under the terms of the nonproliferation treaty the FRG renounced these weapons and the United States pledged not to transfer them to anyone! The Soviet side in Geneva clearly and precisely stated that our people will never accept transforming the FRG into a nuclear power. Unless the FRG explains the prevailing situation and removes the anxiety that many European states now feel at the ambiguity of its position on the Pershing-1A missiles, the USSR will find the situation that has now arisen unacceptable and will express itself directly and unambiguously on that score.

Bonn understood this warning but has apparently failed to draw appropriate conclusions for itself. FRG Government spokesman Schaefer hastened to declare that "the FRG is not a nuclear power and does not want to be one." Excellent! What did he go on to say? What he went on to say was this:

"As for the U.S. warheads on the German Pershing-1A missiles," Schaefer continued, "they are controlled exclusively by the United States." Thus, he expressed on behalf of his government the hope that "the USSR and the United States will arrive at a speedy settlement of the questions that still remain open."

The result seems to be a vicious circle: Washington says the warheads for the Pershing-1A missiles, although they are American, belong to a "third party," in other words, the FRG, and therefore the United States cannot negotiate about them, while Bonn claims that these warheads "are controlled exclusively by the United States" and that all that Bonn can do is hope that "the USSR and the United States arrive at a speedy settlement."

After all this Bonn's spokesman ventured to address hypocritical appeals to the Soviet Union "not to create any artificial obstacles to further talks"!

When you read all these hasty speeches full of infantile ruses, you marvel at how irresponsibly these responsible people are jeopardizing the real possibility of an agreement that would be of truly historic importance and is awaited hopefully by peoples, including the Americans and West Germans!

Expressing the opinion of broad circles of the West German public, SPD Presidium Member Egon Bahr said: "The Pershing-1A missiles equipped with American nuclear warheads that are in service with the Bundeswehr must not become an obstacle to reaching an agreement on eliminating medium-range nuclear missiles and operational and tactical missiles in Europe. The contradictory statements of FRG Government spokesmen regarding the Pershing-1A missiles have created a danger that Bonn's position is becoming a factor impeding efforts in disarmament by the USSR and the United States, and the threat of international isolation hangs over the FRG. In view of the technical specification of the Pershing-1A missiles, they should be included among the missiles to be eliminated in the event that an agreement on the 'double-zero option' is signed."

Broad circles of the public not only in the FRG but also throughout the world realize how serious this issue is. And you can only throw up your hands when you hear a figure like M. Kampelman, head of the U.S. delegation at the Geneva talks, venturing to state that "from the Soviet viewpoint (?) these missiles are of no material [sushchestvennyy] military significance" and that he "does not think they can prevent the reaching of agreement."

In Geneva, the Soviet side clearly and precisely asked Washington and Bonn:

Does the FRG have any nuclear means in service?

Who actually controls the nuclear warheads for the Pershing-1A missiles?

A very great deal depends on the answer to those two questions -- both the fate of an agreement on medium-range missiles and operational and tactical missiles, and the future of the nonproliferation treaty.

Moscow Treaty, Missiles

LD111832 Moscow TASS in English 1814 GMT 11 Aug 87

[Text] Moscow August 11 TASS -- The conclusion of the Moscow Treaty in 1970 was and remains an event of great historical significance as it laid the political ground for comprehensively normalizing relations between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic of Germany as well as set the stage in principle for normalizing relations between the FRG and other socialist states in Eastern Europe, including the German Democratic Republic, Yuriy Gremitikh, first deputy head of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Information Directorate, said in an interview with a TASS diplomatic correspondent today.

The Moscow Treaty has cleared the path to signing the quadripartite agreement on West Berlin and been the decisive political stage on the way to the successful outcome of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and the Helsinki Final Act.

In other words, the Moscow Treaty 25 years after the historic decisions of Yalta and Potsdam has lain as an indispensable cornerstone in the edifice of European peace arrangements.

Much has been said over the 17 years since the Moscow Treaty was signed about its significance to the USSR-FRG relationship: the document has furnished a stable political basis for developing it, which should be unfailingly taken into account and reckoned with in day-to-day politics. This has been confirmed, in particular, during a recent visit to the USSR by Federal President Richard von Weizsaecker of the FRG.

The history of relations between the USSR and the FRG after the signing of the Moscow Treaty has demonstrated graphically that it has served its purpose well as the sides have sought to observe it and fill it with living content. Honest and constructive political dialogue and mutual efforts are needed to foster a favorable climate in bilateral relations and step up trade, cultural exchanges and people-to-people contacts.

But the central problem, of course, is that of our countries' security, Gremitikh said. The FRG today is confronted with a most pressing problem, that of facilitating a Soviet-American agreement on the global elimination of medium-range and shorter-range missiles, by contributing to the attainment of a "double-zero option" for these classes of weapons.

The problem of American warheads for West German Pershing-1A missiles is awaiting a solution. Looking for the West German Government to provide it are not only the governments and peoples of other countries but, as shown by public opinion polls, also by the majority of the people in the FRG as well.

Genscher Receives Shevardnadze Letter

LD121334 Hamburg DPA in German 1300 GMT 12 Aug 87

[Text] Bonn, (DPA) -- Genscher today received a letter from his Soviet counterpart, Eduard Shevardnadze. The Foreign Ministry spokesman gave no indication of the content.

However, it was rumored in Bonn that in the letter Shevardnadze reasserted Moscow's demand that the Bundeswehr's Pershing missiles would have to be included in a Geneva agreement on the removal of medium-range missiles. Apart from this, the Soviet foreign minister once more strongly supported the unanimous demand of the UN Security Council for the ending of the Gulf war. The Federal Republic is this month chairman of the Security Council.

Genscher Ignores Pershing Issue

LD121353 Moscow TASS in English 1327 GMT 12 Aug 87

[Text] Bonn August 12 TASS -- Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher of the Federal Republic of Germany said here Tuesday that his country's interests demanded the conclusion of a Soviet-U.S. agreement on a "double-zero option" and "we shall do everything for it to be signed".

But he passed over in silence the issue of American nuclear warheads for West German Pershing-1A missiles, which are the main sticking point preventing a comprehensive agreement to scrap medium-range and shorter-range missiles.

Despite worldwide public demands, Bonn, supported by Washington, keeps insisting on the Bundeswehr retaining these missiles.

Genscher called for broader cooperation with the Soviet Union, first of all in economic, scientific and technological fields. "We want to open a new page in the history of West German-Soviet relations. This page should be filled in with an unwavering hand. Broadest cooperation meets the interests of both countries," he said.

Karpov on 'Zero-Zero Agreement'

LD121549 Moscow TASS in English 1535 GMT 12 Aug 87

[Quotation marks as received]

[Text] Moscow August 12 TASS -- "Statements by public and state figures in many countries and world press commentaries give one the right to say that the Soviet stand on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles is meeting broad understanding," Viktor Karpov, head of the USSR Foreign Ministry department for arms control and disarmament, told a TASS diplomatic correspondent today.

"The essence of the Soviet stand is as follows: The elimination of Soviet and American medium- and shorter-range missiles should be accompanied by the elimination of American warheads on the West German Pershing-1A missiles.

Such is, in fact, the essence of the 'zero-zero' option," Karpov pointed out.

"If the United States rejects the double-zero deal, it should directly say so. It is no good defending the option while seeking to preserve its nuclear warheads in the Federal Republic of Germany.

The argument that the U.S. has for twenty odd years cooperated with the West German Government in providing nuclear warheads for Pershing-1A missiles is not convincing enough.

If the U.S. wants the agreement, it should secure its implementation from the American side. This means denying West Germany the nuclear warheads," Karpov pointed out.

"As to the West German Government's stand on 'global double zero', we have heard no new arguments worth mentioning since Eduard Shevardnadze's speech in Geneva.

There have emerged signs, however, that not everything has been unequivocally decided within the West German Government, that there are, probably, various viewpoints.

It is worth noting the remarks by Federal Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher to the effect that due to the concentration of nuclear weapons in Europe and on West German territory the Federal Republic could benefit more than other European nations from the viewpoint of security should the U.S. and the USSR reach an agreement on a 'double zero option.'

Let us wait and see whether this means change in the government's overall approach, or is just an expression of the foreign minister's own opinion."

"It has become obvious for all who is impeding the agreement on medium- and shorter-range missiles in Geneva. All realize now that the future of the 'zero-zero' agreement depends on political will, on Washington's decision, a decision that is backed by deeds, rather than words," Karpov said.

FRG-U.S. RAM Complex 'New Twist'

LDO41924 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 4 Aug 87

[Aleksandr Zholkver commentary]

[Text] FRG Minister of Defense Woerner has signed an agreement in Washington on the joint production by the United States and West Germany of the RAM [Rolling Airframe Missile] ship missile complexes. Here is a news commentary from Political Observer Aleksandr Zholkver:

[Zholkver] The head of the West German war department described the agreement he has signed as a genuine breakthrough. But one may be allowed to ask: In what direction? Everywhere in the world, including the FRG itself, the problems of disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament, are being widely discussed. And everyone agrees that the new, large scale initiatives of the USSR have opened up most favorable prospects. But what have Bonn and Washington been busy with in the meantime? A breakthrough in the direction of a new twist in the arms race. The agreement which has just been signed provides for the production of about 7,000 ship missiles. The FRG alone intends to spend more than DM 2 billion to this end. The profit that the biggest military concerns -- including the notorious Messerschmidt which supplied arms to Hitler's Air Force -- will get from it is already being calculated.

And unfortunately the business does not end simply with the ship missiles. Woerner's department is obstinately striving to keep the Pershing-1A missiles for the Bundeswehr, which, according to the West German DPA agency, have a range of up to 750 km and can reach not only the whole of the territory of the GDR but also a large part of Czechoslovakia, Poland and Hungary. (?It is especially noteworthy) that the Pershing-1As, of which there are more than 70 deployed in the FRG, are equipped with nuclear warheads. It is true that these warheads are under U.S. control, as Bonn stresses, but Washington is declaring that if all Soviet and U.S. medium-range and operational tactical missiles are eliminated, and atomic warheads on the West German Pershings must remain untouched since they are allegedly the weapons of a third country. But then that would mean these are the atomic weapons of the FRG -- a violation of all international agreements, including the Nonproliferation Treaty.

Can this be accepted? The West German press and a number of political and public figures of the FRG admit that the Bundeswehr's Pershings have become the stumbling block on the path to the elimination of Soviet and U.S. nuclear missiles, not only in Europe, but in Asia.

Let us add for ourselves, that by adopting such a line, the FRG Government is taking a heavy responsibility on itself.

/9604

CSO: 5200/1620

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR: CONTINUED DISCUSSIONS OF PERSHING 1-A ISSUE

U.S. Stance Unjustifiable

PM291139 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jul 87 Second Edition p 4

[Political observer Yuriy Zhukov article: "Something About Prestige"]

[Excerpt] Reports are now pouring out of Washington like water from a tap to the effect that there can be no question of reaching an accord on the "global double zero" quickly unless ... the USSR makes further concessions!

On the evening of 25 July America's ABC TV reported that, although the "initial U.S. reaction" to the new Soviet initiative was "reservedly optimistic," "an opposition has now emerged." In particular, "members of that opposition" have seized on and are holding fast to the problem--which they artificially created--of the 72 U.S. warheads stationed in the FRG for the Pershing 1-A operational and tactical missiles owned by the Bundeswehr. A very great ballyhoo has been raised in Washington and Bonn over this problem.

To justify the new obstacle in the way of an agreement the fairytale was hastily devised that "the question of West German missiles was introduced (?) at the last minute." Frank Carlucci, the president's current national security adviser, who met with military commentators over luncheon 23 July, told them that the question of the U.S. warheads for the Pershing 1-A missiles had "never been on the table." And, aggrieved, he added: "We do not understand why they (that is, the USSR--Yu.zh.) have erected this obstacle in the way of reaching agreement." Carlucci at once emphasized very significantly that President Reagan is "very resolute on this question."

But, if you please, surely the "global double zero" envisages the elimination of all U.S. and Soviet warheads for medium-range and operational and tactical missiles without exception, wherever they are? But how does it turn out? They propose that the Soviet Union eliminates all warheads of these types without exception, while the United States wants to hold to its bosom 72 warheads, each considerably more powerful than the one that destroyed Hiroshima.

Washington claims over and over again that these 72 U.S. (I emphasize--U.S.!) warheads, which are kept in the FRG to be fitted to the West German Pershing 1-A missiles, are weapons belonging to a "third party" not involved in the talks. How absurd!

Even the West German newspaper WESTFAELISCHE RUNDSCHAU appealed as long ago as 17 July: "Since the Americans own the nuclear warheads which, in fact, turn these missiles into weapons, there can be no question of this being a 'third-country' system."

And again: Surely Washington knows that the Western powers' treaty, signed by the United States, categorically prohibits the FRG from possessing nuclear weapons? Or does Washington consider that treaty, too, now invalid? Not to mention the fact that the FRG has pledged not to have such weapons, having signed the treaty on their nonproliferation.

Such twists in U.S. foreign policy astonish many figures who only yesterday were hearing from U.S. Administration spokesmen reassuring words to the effect that Moscow's new initiative makes rapid progress at the talks attainable.

Here, for example, is what Horst Ehmke, deputy chairman of the West German Social Democratic Party's Bundestag faction, declared in his article published in the U.S. WORLD POLICY JOURNAL 24 July: "Instead of giving an enthusiastic welcome to the USSR's consent to the zero option advanced by NATO itself, its leaders are responding to this cautiously and even with suspicion, advancing new reservations and conditions relating to keeping the 72 Pershing 1-A missiles in West Germany. The alarming prospect has emerged that, through the fault of NATO, the second stage of detente favored by the overwhelming majority of inhabitants of West and East Europe could collapse before it has even begun."

Very true. It only remains for me to add that the views expressed by H. Ehmke are becoming increasingly widespread in West Europe, and not only there. And anyone trying to ignore them would take on a grave responsibility. As the presenter of a British BBC radio program declared 23 July, "it now depends on the United States alone whether or not summit talks are held with a view to signing an agreement on medium-range missiles."

However, let us not draw hasty conclusions. Let us hear what the U.S. side, which is now studying the new Soviet proposal placed on the negotiating table in Geneva, has to say. As for "large-scale" campaign to restore the Washington administration's diminished prestige, I can only sympathize with State Department figure Rozanne Ridgway, who candidly told congressmen that it is "hard to explain" the U.S. tactic at the arms reduction talks in a way that would help to "instantly win European public sympathy."

If those in whose name Rozanne Ridgway speaks really wish to enhance their administration's prestige, the way to do so is clear and simple: Washington has only to instruct the U.S. delegation in Geneva not to cling to the notorious "firm position," which is in no way assisting but, on the contrary, is hampering the reaching of an agreement, and realistically move things forward on the basis of mutually acceptable accords. If the agreement is signed, the U.S. Administration's prestige will also increase.

Fuel FRG Nuclear Ambitions

Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW in English 12 Aug 87 pp 1-3

[Article by APN Analyst V. Katin under the rubric "News and Views": "West Germany out for Nukes"]

[Text] "Who disposes of Pershing 1A nuclear warheads?" Eduard Shevardnadze, USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs, recently asked the Disarmament Conference in Geneva.

Moscow has not yet got an answer to the query which arose due to America's ambiguous stance at the talks on eliminating medium- and shorter-range missiles. The 72 U.S. nuclear warheads intended for West Germany's Pershing 1A missiles have become the stumbling block.

The situation is contradictory. On the one hand, the Soviet Union and the United States have declared their intention to eliminate two classes of Euromissiles down to the last one. Besides, West Germany pledged not to possess nuclear weapons according to the treaty on their non-proliferation. So, the Soviet Union and the United States seem to have every prerequisite for the desired understanding. On the other hand, some West German leaders are out to keep the 72 warheads: a striving overtly supported in Washington.

The Soviet Union can't afford an impassive stance. Novosti Press Agency, newspaper offices and government bodies got lots of letters reflecting public concern about nuclear ambitions of some West German VIPs, especially those prominent in that country's military affairs.

Characteristically, the Bundeswehr's nuclear appetite grows as the chance to do away with Soviet and American nukes in Europe gets ever more tangible: a cause for public concern not only in the Soviet Union but in Poland, the GDR, Alsace-Lorraine and other countries and regions in Europe at whose sight West German revenge-seekers still lick their chops.

Revenge-seekers and neo-nazis have no influence on West Germany and are poorly organised, some say complacently. But we have to be vigilant. The womb that has bred the monster is still fertile, said Bertold Brecht, referring to nazism.

Revenge-seekers do exist in West Germany and even have their organisations who encourage a section of the country's leadership in its nuclear appetites. If the Bundeswehr lays its hands on nukes, revenge-seekers and neo-nazis will raise their heads. The German nation once went through a tragedy as it followed its darkest forces. Those forces may rise once more due to nuclear encouragement, and demand access to power.

We have been hearing a great deal about the FRG authorities' concern for their security. However, a desire to possess nuclear weapons is by no means dictated by considerations of defence. After all, neither the Soviet Union nor the Warsaw Treaty countries as a whole have any territorial claims against the FRG. There is the Soviet pledge never to be the first to use nuclear

weapons, there are the Warsaw Treaty initiatives on reducing conventional arms and armed forces initially by one-fourth, and there is the idea of bringing military doctrines to a purely defensive common denominator.

So the FRG has no need for nuclear weapons as a defensive means. Perhaps some other plans are being hatched in the secret offices of the military departments? What are they?

To my mind, the notorious 72 American nuclear warheads which Bonn has grasped today are not an end in themselves. It is pushing for a precedent. The idea, by all indications, is to legitimise the fact, so to speak, of joint possession of the nuclear warheads. Evidently, this is where everything is pointing, if it has not taken place already. It is not fortuitous that the head of Soviet diplomacy put the question in no uncertain terms: What right does the Federal Republic of Germany have to possess nuclear weapons? As far as we know, it has no juridical or moral right to do so.

By all intents and purposes, the 72 warheads aren't the limit of the dreams of the West German figures who are trying to preserve them. Even now both Bonn and Washington are conducting frank talks on modernising the Pershing-1A missiles, on replacing them with more sophisticated versions. Once again, these plans have nothing at all to do with defence.

I believe that each country in Europe, whether in its eastern or western part, understands the formidable danger that can emerge in the FRG from its desire to possess nuclear weapons. Moscow finds such a situation unacceptable and states officially that the Soviet people will never reconcile itself to West Germany becoming a nuclear power.

(APN, August 11. In full.)

Moscow TV Commentary

LD131639 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 13 Aug 87

[Aleksandr Bovin commentary from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] Two approaches to solving the global problems of mankind. A commentary by IZVESTIYA Political Observer Aleksandr Bovin:

[Bovin] Hello comrades. Probably each one of you, looking at the television and reading the newspapers, has singled out two international topics that have recently been at the center of world attention. They are the situation in and around the Persian Gulf, and the situation around the zero option treaty. In both cases, analysis obliges us to compare to approaches--ours and that of the United States.

On the treaty: We regard zero in its school version, its simplest version, so to speak. You have nothing and we have nothing. But, as it turns out, for the United States zero has a purely metaphorical significance, for it is preparing to retain for itself 72 nuclear warheads for Pershing-1 missiles. Where is the reciprocity? In this case it is generally characteristic for Washington to be reluctant in considering the interests of its partner and to exaggerate the role of the military factor. Washington is characterized by the predominance of propaganda cliches, in their most primitive cheapest form, as it were. That applies both to specific foreign policy actions and if one can put it like this, to the philosophy of foreign policy. In the latter context it is useful to compare the thoughts and ideas expressed by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev when meeting with U.S. Russian language teachers and Saturday's radio address by Ronald Reagan.

What did Gorbachev talk about? He talked about the need for a better and greater understanding of each other; about the cooperation that should save the world from catastrophe; about the fact that it is necessary to search for a solution to the acute problems disturbing the world scene; about the need to seek a way of ensuring that each power behaves very responsibly and does not act as a sort of teacher for another power. In sum, human warmth, a benevolent attitude, understanding of the complexity of our life -- that is what Gorbachev said.

FRG Politicians Lack Unanimity

LD141011 Moscow TASS in English 0936 GMT 14 Aug 87

[Text] Moscow August 14 TASS -- By TASS commentator Lev Aksenov:

Albeit the West German Bundestag is now having its recess, political life in Bonn can be described as extremely intensive: in the centre of public attention are the Bundeswehr Pershing-1A missiles and the nuclear warheads to them, which are under the control of the United States.

Now that the most promising area in the Soviet-American Geneva talks is that of medium-range and shorter-range missiles, the Pershing-1A missiles in possession of the FRG have become the main obstacle in the way towards an agreement. The attempts of the leaders of the USA and the FRG to leave out this problem is broadly condemned both in West Germany and far outside it.

Such a treatment of the question would, in the first place, mean the turning of a possible agreement on medium-range and shorter-range missiles into a sham, and second the danger of FRG's drawing into the nuclear powers' club. The Soviet Union, can, naturally, accept neither.

There are ample examples that the ranks of opponents of Washington's and Bonn's dangerous nuclear missile policy are growing. Literally a few hours ago the Green Party floor in Bundestag demanded a break in the parliamentary recess and convocation of an emergency Bundestag session in order to make official Bonn review its attitude to the problem of Pershing-1A missiles. SPD [Socialist Democratic Party of Germany] Chairman Hans-Jochen Vogel addressed a message to Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl demanding that the possession of 72 medium-range missiles by the Bundeswehr be immediately renounced. A similar demand has also been put forward by Gerd Muhr, deputy chairman of the Confederation of German Trade Unions of the FRG (DGB).

Characteristically there is no unanimity either among the leaders of the parties belonging to the Bonn government coalition. Thus Uwe Ronneburger, deputy chairman of the FDP [Free Democratic Party] parliamentary floor, demanded on Thursday that the 7 Pershing-1A missiles be counted at the Soviet-American Geneva talks.

The declaration by the West German leaders that the FRG is not going to become nuclear power as well as the assurances by the American officials that they sincerely have a stake in a global double zero are in need of a practical proof. It is necessary to give an explicit answer to the question who of them is in fact responsible for this remaining obstacle and what they intend to do so that an agreement become possible?

U.S., FRG Avoiding Issue

LD171626 Moscow TASS in English 1608 GMT 17 Aug 87

[Text] Moscow August 17 TASS -- "Those who contend that the question of the West German Pershing-1A missiles with American nuclear warheads is an invented one, want to obscure the crux of the problem", a TASS diplomatic correspondent was told today by Viktor Karpov, head of the directorate on the disarmament and armaments problem of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

"The matter is that if the Soviet and American medium-range and shorter-range missiles together with their warheads were liquidated while the Pershing-1A missiles with the American warheads were preserved the FRG would remain the only power in the centre of Europe with missiles of this class. Missiles that would pose a threat to the GDR, Poland, Czechoslovakia, a part of Hungary and the western regions of the Soviet Union", Vladimir [name as received] Karpov went on.

"The American warheads for the West German Pershing-1A missiles constitute a serious threat", Viktor Karpov went on. "Each of such warheads is equal, according to some estimates, to seven or even more atomic bombs dropped on Hiroshima. If we multiply this by 72 we will get a very impressive figure. So the issue of central Europe's security in connection with the Pershing-1A missiles is by no means an invented one."

"The press in the GDR and Czechoslovakia is receiving numerous letters from the population expressing concern that the plans to leave Pershing-1A missiles in West Germany with American nuclear warheads places in jeopardy the security of these countries. The letters, in particular, raise the question that the GDR and Czechoslovakia would have to approach the Soviet Union so that by appropriate military measures to counter this threat. So this problem is of an international nature and directly concerns all the peoples of central Europe," Viktor Karpov said further.

"At present the FRG and the United States are trying to avoid answering the question about what should be done with the warheads to the Pershing-1A missiles. Washington points to the FRG and NATO, while Bonn points to Washington. But time demands the adoption of a decision which would open the way to an accord of the elimination of Soviet and American medium- and shorter-range missiles. The only road to this is to implement the 'double zero variant' which was proposed by Mikhail Gorbachev in his interview to the Indonesian newspaper MERDEKA," Viktor Karpov said in conclusion.

Shultz Letter Reported

LD180500 Moscow TASS in English 0421 GMT 18 Aug 87

[Text] Bonn August 17 TASS -- U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz sent a letter to West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher informing him about the stand of the U.S. Administration on the issue of Pershing 1A missiles, DIE WELT newspaper reported in its issue for August 18.

According to the paper, the letter said that the United States had no intention of including the issue of Pershing 1A's into the agenda of the Soviet-U.S. talks at Geneva. The missiles belong to West Germany, although their nuclear warheads are controlled by the U.S. side. The U.S. refusal to take these nuclear warheads into consideration has become the main obstacle on the road to a Soviet-American agreement on medium-range and shorter-range missiles.

The paper reported that the letter from Shultz had arrived to the West German Foreign Ministry last Friday and was conveyed to Genscher who is now on vacation.

In his letter the U.S. secretary of state assured his West German colleague that the United States did not intend to change its position at the talks. In his words, only the systems at the disposal of the U.S.S.R. and the United States are subject of the negotiations at Geneva.

Shultz Letter, U.S. Troop Withdrawal

LD181127 Hamburg DPA in German 1026 GMT 18 Aug 87

[Text] Bonn (DPA) -- From the Soviet Union's view, the letter from U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz to his German counterpart, Hans-Dietrich Genscher (FDP) [Free Democratic Party] means the Americans "have passed the buck to the FRG" as far as the disarmament issue involving the old Pershing-1A missiles are concerned. This was said by a Soviet expert on Germany, Nikolay Portugalov, in an interview with Radio Luxembourg (RTL) today. The advisor at the Soviet Central Committee repeated the Soviet standpoint that the carrier systems of the Federal Army's Pershing-1A's "are of no interest whatever to us."

However, the nuclear warheads under U.S. control belong in the Soviet-U.S. medium-range missile negotiations in Geneva. If the United States agrees to a differentiation between carriers and warheads "then there is practically no further obstacle to an agreement on the double-zero solution," Portugalov said.

It was learned in Bonn that Shultz replied to a letter from Genscher of 7 August in which the Federal foreign minister rejected the accusations made by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze on 6 August at the UN disarmament conference in which the Federal Republic was accused of blocking the disarmament negotiations by its attitude to the Pershing-1A missiles. In this letter, which, just like the Shultz reply of 14 August, has so far not been published, Genscher pointed out both the unanimous view of the alliance on this issue as well as the overwhelming common interest of the alliance in medium-range missile disarmament. In the view of political observers, Shultz's assurance that the Pershing-1A missiles were not the subject of negotiations merely reiterated the old starting position of the Geneva negotiations. Both Genscher and Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl (CDU) [Christian Democratic Union] have in the meantime said the Federal Government will do "everything" to ensure success at the Geneva negotiations.

Bonn/Stuttgart (DPA) -- Willi Wimmer, defense spokesman of the CDU/CSU [Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union] Bundestag group, has warned against the withdrawal of U.S. troops from the Federal Republic. During a visit to the Stuttgart headquarters of the U.S. Armed Forces in Europe today, Wimmer pointed out that there is some concern in the U.S. Congress about U.S. involvement in favor of other crisis points in the world. In view of the Soviet conventional and nuclear arms build up, reduction of U.S. armed forces in Europe without a substantial reduction of their forces as part of the disarmament process would seriously jeopardize the 40-year-old peace in our region, Wimmer said.

Wimmer welcomed the fact that the United States will again prove its commitment to the security of Western Europe during the maneuvers to be held in the Federal Republic in the coming weeks. A total of 34,000 troops of the III U.S. Corps from Fort Hood will be crossing the Atlantic by sea and air to take part in the "Reforger 1987" exercise.

Karpov: Make Decision

LD181250 Moscow TASS in English 1220 GMT 18 Aug 87

["Pershing-1A Missiles--Urgent Problem"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow August 18 TASS -- A decision on the problem of West German Pershing-1A missiles and American warheads for them should be taken without delay, Viktor Karpov, head of the department for the arms limitation and disarmament problems of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, stated today in an interview with the TASS diplomatic correspondent.

At present preparations are under way for a meeting between Eduard Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, and George Shultz, U.S. secretary of state, which is planned to be held in Washington in mid-September, this year. The meeting should be prepared in such a way that it could bring positive results. It is hardly sensible to leave the problem of West German Pershing-1A missiles and American warheads for them till the meeting between the Soviet foreign minister and the U.S. secretary of state.

If in the coming several weeks the Governments of the United States and West Germany do not display a necessary sense of responsibility, understanding, as well as goodwill, if real prospects do not emerge of the settlement of the Pershing-1A problem, the question will naturally arise whether it will be possible to resolve this problem during the coming meeting of Eduard Shevardnadze and George Shultz and whether the meeting itself will be expedient in this case, the Soviet expert said. It is hardly reasonable to burden the ministers with the search for the working whose working out will not be ensured beforehand by the coordination in principles of the stands of both sides. Thus, it is the turn of Washington and Bonn to reciprocate.

Arbatov, Moynihan Interviewed

LD190058 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 18 Aug 87

[Text] [Announcer] A U.S. Senate delegation led by Senator Daniel Moynihan is in the USSR at the invitation of the Supreme Soviet. On Tuesday, the senators discussed prospects of Soviet-American relations with leading Soviet experts at the U.S. and Canada Studies Institute in Moscow. After the discussion our reporter, Sergey Goryachev, took an interview with Senator Moynihan and the head of the U.S. and Canada Studies Institute, Georgiy Arbatov.

[Goryachev] First of all, I would like to thank both of you for this opportunity to talk, both of you here, and my first question is to our guest, Senator Moynihan: What are your objectives? What do you want to achieve by visiting the Soviet Union now?

[Moynihan] We came -- Senator Sanford, Senator Sarbanes, and I -- with the principal interest of to learn more about the changes that have been talked about, announced and proposed, perestroika -- do I have that right? -- glasnost. Well, we had a meeting yesterday with members of the Supreme Soviet, the Soviet of the Union, including the speaker, Mr Tomakov [as heard] and had the opportunity to say that we felt it, that our two nations were very close to concluding a treaty with respect to intermediate nuclear forces which would be the first treaty in history where two parties agreed to the actual elimination and destruction of nuclear weapons. We thought that was a major event.

[Goryachev] Thank you. Now the same question goes to Dr Arbatov. What are your aims and what do you want to achieve by talking to the U.S. senators?

[Arbatov] I know for one thing that the situation will not become worse, and I hope very much that it becomes better when we are talking. We haven't talked for a too long time and have seen that it can bring us only into misperceptions, misunderstandings, and exacerbate the troubles we have anyway. And it is high time that this becomes a routine operation which is done on a routine basis, as a (?mark) for both members of executive and legislative and all other bodies of government -- that they meet each other, that they can discuss with each other and improve the understanding of the other side. I am personally absolutely sure that with all the differences in interests, even we can cooperate in much broader fields than we do up till now and this is just one of the efforts to make it easier.

[Goryachev] Thank you. Let's talk about the INF treaty. Senator, you have already touched upon this problem. This INF treaty seemed to take us off the ground in terms of doing things rather than talking about them, but there is a problem: the U.S. warheads in West Europe, in West Germany. What is your position on these warheads?

[Moynihan] Our position is that they are, that they've always been there, they're an ageing force, we've not negotiated the British forces in this regard nor yet the French. These are not a problem for anyone. Let us not suppose that if we have this treaty there is going to be...[changes thought] somehow nuclear weapons are just going to disappear; they're hardly the case. [as heard] What we have done is show that you can reach, if we do it, you can reach agreement to reduce the numbers of certain specific weapons, and we should. And I think that's probably all I should say.

[Goryachev] In other words, if I got you right, you come in favor of the warheads being kept in West Germany?

[Moynihan] Yes.

[Goryachev] Dr Arbatov, your position?

[Arbatov] Well, my position's a different one. I can explain why. These are American warheads and the Americans raised the problem of smaller range nuclear weapons, and therefore they for a moment forgot that 72 of them are on German missiles, actually American missiles which (?have been) sold to the Germans. And the fact that we made some concessions, having agreed at this moment to just ignore British and French weapons, doesn't mean that we can do it here again, and I think that the Americans must understand and should understand, also, that if we conclude this treaty there will be 671 Soviet weapons removed, launchers, and 380 American. So, 300 more Russians. I don't think they should make it stop. It would be even in their interests because of 82 [as heard] German weapons, especially if they are outdated.

[Goryachev] Okay, Senator Moynihan, you have something to say about this?

[Moynihan] Yes. I have to say: Let Radio Moscow tend to its own affairs. We have excellent negotiators in Geneva and I'm sure they'll do a good job.

[Announcer] The affair we have to tend to at Radio Moscow is providing our listeners with both perspectives on this issue. That was an interview with Senator Daniel Moynihan and the head of the U.S. and Canada Studies Institute, Georgiy Arbatov, by our reporter Sergey Goryachev. A U.S. Senate delegation is in the USSR at the invitation of the Supreme Soviet.

TASS Military Writer

LD191728 Moscow TASS in English 1700 GMT 19 Aug 87

[Text] Moscow August 19 TASS — TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev comments:

At Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva, where thanks to the Soviet initiatives all conditions were created for finalizing the elaboration of an agreement on a "double global zero" for intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, the United States with support of its closest allies gets on with impeding the movement forward.

The issue of the U.S. nuclear warheads for the West German "Pershing-1A" missiles has been chosen this time as the key barrier. What is behind such a nonconstructive stand by Washington?

First, the "warheads problem" is regarded by definite quarters in the NATO countries, first and foremost in the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany, as the last means to block an agreement on abolishing nuclear weapons, the first one in history. The "zero option" has never been the goal of those quarters. It was assigned the role of a propaganda cover-up and it alone for building up U.S. nuclear arsenals in Europe.

Western experts write that in the current circumstances it is enough for the opponents of the talks to delay them negotiations for several months only and everything will hang in mid-air as there will appear to be no time to push an agreement through Congress before the presidential elections in the United States.

Second, if contrary to counteraction, an agreement is signed, Washington would like to retain its nuclear warheads for 72 shorter-range missiles under the pretext of satisfying the needs of the ally in the bloc. In Washington they do not conceal their intention to circumvent the future agreement with the aid of West Germany, to remain in actual fact the sole possessor of shorter-range nuclear missile weapons.

Third, Washington and Bonn's designs are linked not only with retaining the existing nuclear warheads for West German missiles. They envisage what is considerably more than that is retaining the opportunity to modernize or replace these systems with more advanced ones. Plans have already been devised at the West German Defence Ministry to replace "Pershing 1-A" with new "Pershing-1B" systems which are essentially a one-stage variant of intermediate-range missiles.

This means the United States and West Germany make attempts to secure a loophole for Bundeswehr's "re-armament" with more advanced shorter-range missiles which are easily and speedily converted into medium-range missiles.

Fourth, the "long-term" goal pursued by Washington and some of its allies is to avoid an "unfavourable precedent" for future talks on reducing tactical nuclear weapons.

The point is that the NATO countries' armed forces have a whole number of systems of the tactical purpose (missiles, aircraft, artillery facilities, etc.), nuclear munitions for which belong to the United States.

For instance, according to the figures of U.S. specialists, the U.S. arsenal holds 380 missile warheads (for "Lance" missiles), 300 nuclear bombs, 400 shells for 203.2-mm nuclear artillery, 150 shells for 155-mm nuclear artillery, and 50 depth-charges, which are destined for these West European systems of the so-called double command.

So, all this arsenal is sought to be "protected" against destruction even in case an agreement on reducing tactical nuclear weapons is reached in the future between the USSR and the United States. The "precedent" of dismantling nuclear warheads for the West German "Pershing-1A" missiles would not allow the United States, under the cover-up of the thesis of the existing character of cooperation with the allies, to keep its nuclear presence in Europe.

All these calculations have only one purpose -- to attain unilateral advantage at the negotiating table. It is time they in Washington, Bonn and some other capitals of the NATO countries realize all the importance of the political moment, perceive that the world public will not forgive those who seek to hamper using the unique chance for opening in practice the way towards removing the nuclear threat to mankind.

Gerasimov: U.S. Position 'Illogical'

DW190711 Hamburg BILD in German 19 Aug 87 p 2

[Interview with "Kremlin Spokesman" Gennadiy Gerasimov by correspondent "WKE,"
date and place not given]

[Text] The position of the Americans that the Bundeswehr's Pershing-1A missiles cannot become the subject of the Geneva disarmament talks is "illogical," Kremlin Spokesman Gerasimov told BILD.

He said: "We want to have a genuine zero solution for the medium-range systems in Europe. One cannot be half a virgin. It is all or nothing."

BILD: So the Geneva negotiations will fail?

Gerasimov: "We want the medium-range agreement and I think the Americans want it too. The Americans must now say in Geneva how they visualize an agreement. The Pershing-1A missiles remain an obstacle for us.

"However, if the West insists on them, we will have to deploy the same number and kind of missiles in the 'GDR' and make those missiles available to the 'GDR'. I believe that nobody in the West wants that."

/8309

CSO: 5200/1630

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

SOVIET COLONEL VIEWS U.S. OBJECTIONS TO ON-SITE INSPECTIONS

PM061149 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Aug 87 First Edition p 3

[Colonel V. Nazarenko article: "Who Fears Verification:"]

[Text] The prospect of an agreement being reached on the elimination of Soviet and U.S. operational and tactical and medium-range missiles in Europe has clearly alarmed certain circles in the West. They are seeking more and more pretexts for, if not totally wrecking, at least impeding the adoption of a constructive solution as far as possible. FRG Chancellor Kohl demands that U.S. nuclear warheads remain for West Germany's Pershing 1A's. Japanese Prime Minister Nakasone insists on the siting of U.S. medium-range missiles in Alaska. Former U.S. National Security Adviser Brzezinski demands for no reason at all the elimination of missiles on the European Continent be made contingent on the scrapping of all Soviet tanks, which have allegedly been prepared to invade the NATO countries' territories. There is no end of provisions, conditions, riders...

The so-called U.S. intelligence community -- the CIA, NSA, and FBI -- have also had their say. U.S. intelligence staffers have told the White House that the provision relating to on-site inspection [inspektsiya na mestakh] in any future agreement reducing and eliminating nuclear missile arms, primarily medium-range missiles, should not be extended to their "brainchild" -- intelligence installations. You see, they do not want "Soviet inspectors to stroll unhindered around their intelligence-gathering installations." This would allegedly be "fraught with a serious danger that surpasses the advantage of potential access to Soviet secret military installations."

The U.S. intelligence services are scared that as a result of such inspections [inspektsiya] the USSR might find out too much about U.S. intelligence-gathering methods. That is why they claim that it is necessary to exclude a minimum of several hundred such installations from the verification system. Intelligence specialists have been giving assurances that there is no point focusing attention on such demands or attaching particular importance to them. After all, such inspections [inspektsiya] are just an "insignificant" component in the overall monitoring plan, which is sufficiently effective as it stands. And even if the right to on-site inspections [inspektsiya na mestakh] is not made absolute, this will not affect the reliability of verification.

Incidentally, there are also many "specialists" among U.S. Administration representatives for whom the value of inspection [inspektsiya] on demand has suddenly turned out to be highly exaggerated. "On-site inspection [inspektsiya na mestakh] is not a panacea for all the problems of monitoring," K. Adelman, director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, stated recently "History shows that on-site inspections [inspektsiya na mestakh] can be a hindrance."

To be blunt, the U.S. intelligence community is now proposing what amounts to a radical departure from the U.S. Administration's long-standing position in arms control. Pointing to this, THE NEW YORK TIMES stresses: "Washington cannot demand the right to implement meticulous verification on Soviet territory without granting the Russians an analogous right." That is concise and understandable.

/9604

CSO: 5200/1620

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

SOVIET COMMENTATORS VIEW INF PROSPECTS, MERDEKA INTERVIEW

LD072159 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 7 Aug 87

["International Situation--Questions and Answers" program presented by foreign policy commentator Vladimir Pasko, with Vitaliy Chukseyev, chief editor of TASS foreign news service, commentator Boris Andrianov, commentator Igor Sugurchev, and All-Union Radio foreign policy commentator Nikolay Agayants]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] [Chukseyev] The special interest in the Soviet initiative, which many political and public figures of the world are calling historic, has been caused, it would seem, by two things. First, the prospects for concluding an agreement on the liquidation of nuclear missiles of two categories have become more realistic than ever. Second, such an accord would mean a real breakthrough in the whole process of limiting and reducing nuclear arsenals.

It is generally recognized that it is the position of the U.S. Administration over the 72 Pershing-1A missiles, which have been handed over to the jurisdiction of the West German Bundeswehr but armed with U.S. nuclear warheads, that is now the main obstacle to signing a treaty. From day to day, journalists at press conferences in the White House, in the State Department, and in interviews with government officials try to find solutions to the so-called Washington-style arithmetic according to which the maintenance of the 72 nuclear charges in central Europe is identified with complete zero.

The Pershings are not a subject of the U.S.-Soviet talks -- that is the standard reply journalists hear every time. Recognizing the unpopularity and the illogic of such a position, Western spokesmen are trying in every way to confuse the issue, so to speak. [passage omitted]

In refusing to deprive the Bundeswehr of Pershings with nuclear warheads, Washington is essentially moving toward perpetuating West Germany's nuclear status, and, as is known, this counters international agreements ratified by the United States, among others. [passage omitted]

[Pasko] [Passage omitted] Indonesia and the Soviet Union express their identity of views in many respects in their assessment of the world situation. This applies to the most urgent problem of today, that of safeguarding peace and international security.

Our countries are unanimous in the belief that all states, especially those with nuclear weapons, should play their role in eliminating the threat of a nuclear catastrophe and express their readiness to work together in this with all other countries irrespective of the size of or differences between their sociopolitical systems. Like the Soviet Union, Indonesia favors an immediate end to any nuclear weapons tests and the speediest possible conclusion of a multilateral treaty on their complete prohibition. It is categorically opposed to spreading the arms race to outer space and calls for a stepping up of efforts at the disarmament conference with the objective of concluding a convention on prohibiting chemical weapons.

The common nature of the approach of our countries is also apparent in questions of the need for a political settlement to conflicts and disputes in the world. We favor a stepping up of efforts by the Asian states in the quest for ensuring security in the Asia-Pacific region and for the speediest convocation of an international conference on turning the Indian Ocean into a peace zone and for creating nuclear-free zones in various parts of the planet. The Soviet Union and Indonesia favor restructuring international economic relations on a just and democratic basis. Both countries come out for a switching of resources now spent on arms over to the purposes of socioeconomic development, including rendering assistance to the developing countries. [passage omitted]

/8309

CSO: 5200/1630

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR'S 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE' ON ARMS TALKS

LD091829 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 9 Aug 87

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Professor Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, political observer of Central Television and All-Union Radio; Vitaliy Ivanovich Kobysh, publicist; and Vladimir Yakovlevich Tsvetov, political observer of central television and all-union radio]

[Text] [Tsvetov] Hello, comrades. I don't think I'll be far wrong if I say that one of the main problems now at the center of world attention is the agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States on medium-range missiles and operational and tactical missiles. Listeners will probably have noted the image by which Comrade Shevardnadze has described, at the Geneva disarmament conference, the road leading to that agreement, but I'll remind you. He said something like this: Since Reykjavik, that road has been shortened by almost 2,000 warheads, leaving only 72 Pershing-1A missiles between us and the end of the road. These constitute the obstacle not only to making the elimination of two classes of nuclear weapons a reality but also to creating the prerequisites for eliminating strategic offensive arms and preventing the extension of the arms race into space.

[Zorin] What is the meaning of the distance covered and the distance remaining? To what? Not simply to an agreement, though agreement is important, but to an agreement of a kind that is without precedent in the whole of human history. For as long as human civilization has existed, for as long as human society has existed, it has been accumulating weapons of destruction. And what point have we now reached? On what threshold do we stand? We are on the threshold of a possible agreement that, for the first time in history, would reverse that trend. It isn't just a question of an agreement on the control [kontrol] of arms, or on the control of conditions of one sort or another, but rather of...

[Tsvetov, interrupting] And it's not even a question of an agreement on reduction. It's not even a question of reduction.

[Zorin] Moreover -- you're right, Vladimir Yakovlevich -- the point is that we've got to destroy a whole class of very destructive weapons, very dangerous weapons. But it isn't even a question of that: It's a question of beginning a possible chain reaction and of overcoming a barrier that is both psychological and political. Let me take an example from sports. When Sergey (Bubko) achieved a height of 6 meters, people said not only that it was a fantastic jump but also that a seemingly insuperable psychological barrier had been overcome. Suddenly, such a height was possible. For many decades we have had it drilled into us that talk of arms reduction was a beautiful

but unrealizable dream. Now we're just an arm's length away from concluding such an agreement. It is all the more bitter and alarming that what is no more than an arm's length away may, after all, not happen.

[Tsvetov] No doubt the opponents of this agreement are also frightened by the prospect that if we do succeed in concluding an agreement on medium-range missiles and operational and tactical missiles, the way will be open to compromise solutions on other issues, namely on eliminating strategic offensive weapons and on preventing the spread of the arms race into space.

[Kobysh] Yes, and the opponents of these agreements are now resorting to some very strange and even slightly comical methods. This 72 Pershing-1A missile affair is running its course just now. The missiles belong to the FRG and their warheads to the United States. So when the question is raised of the need to eliminate them also, the United States says: we can't do that because they belong to the FRG. When Bonn is told they must be eliminated, they answer: We can't because the warheads belong to the United States.

[Tsvetov] By the way, Stuelpnagel, the leader of the West German delegation at the Geneva disarmament conference, replied to Comrade Shevardnadze, who had addressed this question directly to him, that the warheads are not at the disposal of the FRG, but of the United States.

[Zorin] That's right, but that's what they say in Bonn. They have allocated the roles: the missiles and the warheads belong to different countries, so an agreement would seem to be impossible. In this regard, the question is being raised in the West: What if the Soviet Union does the same? If the Warsaw Pact takes the same line and say, Czechoslovakia or the GDR has missiles with Soviet warheads and the same argument is used, what then?

[Tsvetov] In other words, if the GDR and Czechoslovakia had the missiles, and the Soviet Union had the warheads.

[Kobysh] Then arises the question: who needs all this?

[Zorin] That is a very interesting question, Vitaliy Ivanovich, and one that's not so easy to answer. Probably, if we'd been discussing it a couple of years ago, we might, as students of international affairs, have given the easy answer and said it meets Washington's needs. We'd have been right because it's perfectly obvious that behind this game, this dangerous political foul play, stands, above all, the United States, which is also manipulating the politicians in Bonn who, to put it mildly, listen when the United States speaks. But perhaps today it is necessary to paint a more profound and more objective picture.

I have the impression there are circles in Washington, very powerful and influential circles at that, that would now be ready and willing to sign an agreement in Geneva as quickly as possible. In the past 2 or 3 months I've had one or two conversations with U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, and I got the impression that he is one of those politicians in Washington who wants to bring about an agreement on medium-range missiles. But there are those who oppose that line. There seems to be a very tough struggle going on in Washington behind the scenes, in places, moreover, where even the omnipresent U.S. correspondents are not allowed to penetrate.

[Kobysh] Where perhaps even the U.S. secretary of state has no entree.

[Tsvetov] It's possible.

[Zorin] I want to draw listeners' attention to two recent facts that don't seem to me to have been given the importance they deserve. They've been reported, but we don't seem to have managed to connect them with the general process of events. In the last couple of months, two men have left the administration who throughout all the years of its existence have been considered some of the main hawks -- perhaps the main ones -- in that administration.

First, Richard Perle, one of the heads of the Pentagon, announced he was about to retire. Vitaliy Ivanovich, you and I saw Perle in action at Reykjavik at fairly close quarters and saw the damage he was trying to do to the negotiations there.

[Kobysh] We even took part in discussions with him, so we know his attitudes.

[Zorin] He's not just a minor official but a man who has had enormous influence on Weinberger and the President of the United States. Suddenly, to many people's surprise, as Washington was getting closer to the point where it would be possible to reach agreement on the most important issues of disarmament, Perle was thrown overboard, to be followed a few weeks later by Kenneth Adelman, another hawk and another representative of the military-industrial complex in Reagan's administration. I personally think the fact that Perle and Adelman, rather than any of the others -- and there are other, less odious figures -- that precisely Perle and Adelman should have been forced out of the administration at this particular stage, gives us some idea of how and in what direction the struggle over the question of reaching an agreement is going behind the scenes in Washington. I don't want to be understood as saying that the advocates of an agreement are getting the upper hand.

[Kobysh] There is food for thought, of course, but I wouldn't exaggerate this. When Weinberger retires, now, if he goes, I'll certainly agree with you. Until then, there's food for thought and we'll have to wait and see how events develop.

[Zorin] We are not disagreeing, Vitaliy Ivanovich, but I want to complete my train of thought. There are, and this is beyond dispute, certain figures and certain circles within the administration who are showing an interest in seeing an agreement concluded. For various reasons. Surely the Iran-contras scandal is influencing the Geneva talks?

[Kobysh] Well, of course.

[Zorin] It is effecting them in a variety of ways. One of our colleagues, by the way, recently published an article, the gist of which was that the scandal has ended with the ending of the congressional hearings. Well, I disagree entirely with that view. The hearings are over, but the special prosecutor is still at work, and his investigations may be very productive. In any case...

[Kobysh] But that's not the point. The point is the feelings of public opinion now that it knows that it is being deceived.

[Zorin] Yes, there's that as well, Vitaliy Ivanovich. But why am I talking about the link between the scandal and what's happening in Geneva? Here's the latest issue of that well-informed magazine, TIME, the 10 August issue, that states without beating about the bush: There is perhaps nothing that can help to revive the President's leading role after the Iran-contras scandal more than achieving an agreement with the Soviet Union on a broad reduction of medium-range [promezhutochnoy dalnosti] nuclear missiles. During his last 16 months in office, the President can still secure himself a more significant place in history. That's in the latest issue of the magazine. And indeed, one can regard this as one of the motives now guiding those who make the decisions in Washington. One can -- one shouldn't reduce it to just this -- regard it as one of the motives.

[Kobysh] I would not reduce it all merely to politicking. You, Valentin Sergeyevich, know better than most, that serious processes and reassessments are now underway in the United States. Public opinion is agitated, and the American people are not at all what they used to be. Americans are now fully aware of the threat looming over mankind, and the ruling class is not standing on the sidelines. It's not only sensible, ordinary people but also people in the arms manufacturing business who are beginning to wonder how to live in the future, how their children and grandchildren are going to live.

[Zorin] I both agree and disagree with you. I believe that a new mood is revealing itself among the Americans, there's no doubt about that. I disagree because it seems to me you are overestimating a little. Average Americans, in their mass, have still not realized the full acuteness of the situation. As for what you called politicking, you, Vitaliy Ivanovich, lived long enough in the United States as a correspondent to know what the U.S. domestic political scene is like when the presidential election campaign gets underway. Any step taken today, whether in domestic policy -- the Iran-contras scandal -- or in foreign policy -- the Geneva talks -- is calculated by U.S. politicians first and foremost from the point of its likely effect on the November 1988 elections. For that reason, what I have mentioned is, in my view, a very serious political factor that has to be seriously considered.

[Tsvetov] I think our leadership is perfectly aware of the whole situation taking shape in U.S. political life, and I think the actions now undertaken on the international scene include all the points we have been discussing.

[Zorin] I'd just like to add one clarification to what you have said, Vladimir Yakovlevich. Naturally, we take into account the circumstances of the United States' domestic political life, but it is not the zig zags of U.S. domestic politics by which the Soviet Union guides itself, in putting forward its proposals and implementing the overall line of its foreign policy.

[Tsvetov] This overall foreign policy line is aimed at ridding the world of nuclear weapons by the year 2000. Taking into consideration the circumstances, taking into consideration the stances of our negotiating partners, and taking into consideration the overall international situation, the Soviet Union is constantly putting forward more and more new proposals. At this point I might enumerate the actions undertaken by the Soviet Union in order to bring closer an agreement on the elimination of medium-range missiles and operational and tactical missiles. The Soviet Union withdrew the condition regarding British and French nuclear forces. The Soviet Union agreed to examine the matter of medium-range missiles separately from strategic and space weapons. The Soviet Union agreed to the complete liquidation of the missiles we are discussing not only in Europe, but in Asia as well, leaving aside, moreover, the matter of the other nuclear weapons, apart from medium-range and operational and tactical missiles, possessed by the United States in the Asia-Pacific Ocean region. Finally, the Soviet Union postponed the solution of the matter of airplanes as nuclear weapons delivery vehicles that is, that of medium-range bombers. Some of our radio listeners are asking whether we are not going too far in our concessions. And here, I have to bring up a term which evaluates our stance very accurately: This stance is based on the concept of reasonable sufficiency.

[Zorin] If you will allow me, Vladimir Yakovlevich, I shall develop this thesis a little. What is reasonable sufficiency, and are we not taking too great steps to meet our negotiating partners halfway? There are 50,000 nuclear warheads today in the arsenals -- primarily those of the Soviet Union and the United States.

[Tsvetov] Valentin Sergeyevich, that is 1.3 million bombs like the one which destroyed Hiroshima -- 1.3 million.

[Zorin] A small part of these arsenals is sufficient to destroy all life on Earth -- just a small part. Once the world has been destroyed once, it won't need to be destroyed a 2d, 10th or 30th time. So the Soviet leadership is taking steps in a sensible direction, renouncing the completely unnecessary excesses. Soviet politicians and scientists are putting forward the term reasonable sufficiency, the essence of which consists in the fact that for a retaliatory strike at an aggressor and, as the specialists say, for causing him unacceptable damage -- that is, the kind of damage which would restrain him from aggression -- it is enough to use just a few percent of the strategic arsenal of the country that has been subjected to attack of the current strategic arsenal. And this provides opportunities to reduce nuclear, and indeed other weapons, in large-scale blocks at once, without fearing any encroachment on one's security. In addition, reasonable sufficiency presupposes that deterrence of the other side is not so much a matter of balancing it by force, as of restraining it's leadership from starting a war. And it is this idea of reasonable sufficiency which forms the basis of many of our proposals. Up until now we have been proposing getting rid of that which is superfluous for defending security and consequently there are not grounds for the fears of those of our radio listeners who consider that our steps on disarmament might damage our security.

[Kobysh] I would like to return to the previous subject and say it is precisely these leanings and these ideas -- and you, colleagues, know this -- finding a response in the United States. They find response not only among academics in universities like Princeton, Harvard, Yale, and Berkeley, the most high ranking scientific centers, but also among quite wide masses of the population. People understand that mankind has reached an impasse and the United States has reached an impasse and that one must get out of this impasse. When you, Valentin Sergeyevich, spoke about public opinion polls, there are many of them. On the whole, the public opinion polls show the population favors reducing weapons and halting the arms race. It opposes nuclear weapons and does not want tension building further. This is what the public opinion polls show. In all, it is these ideas of ours that are finding a response -- not only in the United States but also in Western Europe, in the Asian countries, and in the Asian and South Pacific region -- which is now gaining special importance. This creates, of course, a particular atmosphere in the world and a particular climate, and our proposals find a response. It is very interesting what Rajiv Gandhi said on the global double-zero option forwarded by the Soviet Union. He said this opens a way for concluding the first agreement since World War II that will really ensure disarmament.

[Tsvetov] This concept of reasonable sufficiency, it seems to me, is also reflected in the Soviet draft treaty on reducing and limiting strategic offensive weapons. Our listeners know that a few days ago the Soviet Union forwarded this draft at the Soviet-U.S. talks. I will briefly remind you of the essence of this draft: Over the next 5 years, the USSR and the United States will reduce their strategic offensive weapons enough to lower the total number of ICBM's, SLVM's and heavy bombers to less than 1600 units on both sides. The nuclear warheads on all these carriers will be limited to 600 on each side -- that is a 50-percent reduction of all those enormous arsenals of whose pointlessness you have just spoken, Valentin Sergeyevich. Here also, I must say, the Soviet Union has found very interesting compromise solutions that, it seems to me, cannot fail to arouse the interest of the United States.

For example, the Soviet Union agreed to halve its heavy ICBM's -- those very missile that arouse them most U.S. concern. This is a big concession, but it is reasonable. It is the kind of concession prompted by political common sense, on the one hand, and on the other hand, by caring about the ultimate outcome, about achieving a reduction and ultimately the elimination, of nuclear weapons.

[Kobysh] It seems to me that the common sense, and above all, the inevitability of the approach proposed by the Soviet Union has become especially clear in recent days. I have in mind the situation that has arisen in the Persian Gulf.

[Tsvetov] Yes. By the way, we must now treat this situation with special attention because all those talks that we are now discussing are not being conducted in a vacuum. They are having effect on those people conducting these extremely important talks.

[Zorin] Before you continue, I will remind you and our radio listeners that according to expert estimates, 20 wars are now in progress round the world. Twenty wars! Millions of people are getting killed.

[Tsvetov] Yet the most serious dangerous thing for the general international situation is, of course, the war in the Persian Gulf.

[Zorin] Yes, this is why I link the problem of moving along the path of disarmament with the situation in the Persian Gulf. Here we see especially clearly the kind of nuclear -- not a powder -- keg mankind now lives on. In the Persian Gulf the situation is such that at any time a serious skirmish might begin there. Let us say, a launch handled by suicides -- a death crew -- fanatics...

[Tsvetov, interrupting] Kamikaze of the Iranian sort.

[Zorin] Runs into a U.S. ship, and there are so many of those in the Gulf. Washington has already stated that the targets that will be hit by the U.S. Air Force, U.S. artillery, and U.S. missiles if this happens, have already been identified. So a sheer chance, even now while we are holding our discussion, may lead to a serious skirmish in this very dangerous area. And this is happening in a world that has accumulated 50,000 nuclear warheads! Can one live in such a world?

[Tsvetov] Now while drawing to a close our conversation on the subjects with which we are all concerned, I would like to say this: We have just been talking about military and political aspects of nuclear disarmament problems. But these problems also have a moral aspect. Surely, only those with a time-serving mentality can oppose disarmament, and above all nuclear disarmament. In any case, profound indifference as to the fate of mankind, as to whether it survives or not -- in other words "apres nous le deluge" -- stands behind the arms race. Yet, if one takes the Soviet initiatives and Soviet policy, one can see that the specifics of this policy are indeed prompted, as we've been saying by political business-like soberness, while the spirit of this policy rests on genuine humanistic concern for the future of humanity and its survival. This is where, it seems to me, the difference in our approaches to the major issues of modern times is to be found. This difference is a result of the radical distinction between capitalism and socialism. Now I would like to say good-bye to you, comrades. All the best.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1630

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

SOVIET 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE' DISCUSSES INF, CW, VERIFICATION

LD162055 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 16 Aug 87

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Igor Pavlovich Charikov, All-Union Radio foreign political commentator; TASS Political Observer Aleksey Nikolayevich Grigoryev; and MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI Viktor Aleksandrovich Tsoppi]

[Excerpts] Well, comrades, another reason why we began this discussion with the situation in the Gulf is that this really is a threat to peace. The major imperialist powers have mighty forces concentrated in that region.

[Grigoryev] The vital interests of many powers, and not only of the imperialist powers, but of ours too.

[Charikov] Exactly. Also because this situation -- we use the word explosive so often that we cease to feel the full force of its meaning -- because this situation underlines once again that today, the subject of disarmament remains just as urgent and important as ever: The prospect of achieving an accord on curbing the arms race and reducing and subsequently destroying arms as such. In this regard, I think it's high time we moved on to another, no less important theme: the theme of disarmament, the theme of limiting nuclear armaments.

[Tsoppi] I think the most important developments in this respect are taking place in Geneva, especially at the disarmament conference, which was addressed just over a week ago by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze. There, indeed, the most central, the most complex and the most urgent issues of our time are being debated. I'd like to remind you of a few of the points made by the Soviet foreign minister in his speech in Geneva, which I'd say was of programmatic importance, indeed a keynote speech. He recalled very appositely a thought by the great inhabitant of Geneva, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, that has a contemporary ring: The natural condition of man is equality and freedom. If that is the natural condition of man -- and it is, it's what we all aspire to -- then today, when we reflect on how to achieve that harmony in equality and freedom, we must proceed from an analysis of our time, from an analysis of the situation that has today led to the threat -- unless we stop in time -- the threat of inevitable nuclear war. It's in Geneva that negotiations are in progress between the United States and the Soviet Union on the whole complex of nuclear weapons. In Geneva, too, a wider forum, an international forum that has existed for many years, is also again grappling with this issue, which cannot, of course, be decided by the two great powers alone, but which all states and all peoples have an interest in solving.

[Charikov] Let me remind you that the Soviet foreign minister spoke in his address of the problems of reducing medium-range missiles in Europe. He said that this is today an attainable goal, that in effect, the positions of the United States of America and the Soviet Union come much closer together as a result of the very flexible and very active position of the Soviet Union as a result of our specific proposals and specific initiatives. Everything seemed to have been arranged and agreed: It had been decided that all nuclear weapons having a range between 500 and 1,000 kilometers must be reduced and destroyed altogether.

Then suddenly the problem arose of just 72 missiles, which are situated on the FRG territory and which belong to that country, but for the warheads -- nuclear warheads -- which belong to the United States. We find that for some reason, these 72 missiles, which are just as great a threat to the security of all West Germany's nearest neighbors as if it were a question of some other missiles situated further away, that precisely these missiles are the ones they don't want to destroy. Why is that, Aleksey Nikolayevich?

[Grigoryev] Well, the first thing I'd point out is that these 72 Pershing-1A missiles have become the subject of a whirl of propaganda that is as unseemly as it is unconvincing. Above all, the two proprietors of these missiles -- the owners of the missiles themselves and the owners of the warheads -- having made these weapons into a stumbling-block at the talks, are constantly passing the buck to each other and explaining: we don't have full ownership, it's the others that own them, and vice versa -- Peter pointing the finger at Paul. Immediately after this question of the missiles had been presented so plainly and clearly by Comrade Shevardnadze in his speech, official Bonn reacted with various statements, including a statement by an official spokesman of the West German Government, Schaefer.

The claim was that the FRG had nothing to do with these missiles since they belonged exclusively to the United States. At once -- literally -- answering voices rang out from across the Atlantic. Among them was the voice of the leader of the U.S. delegation at the Geneva talks, Max Kampelman, who said, literally: We can only speak for ourselves. We are not negotiating for West Germany. I fully understand the German position, and if we deprived them of these warheads, we'd be violating our relationship with our allies and giving them a slap in the face. Well, really, this whole whirl is transparent and obvious: on the one hand, they've found an obviously artificial impediment to the negotiations, an attempt to force the Soviet Union to make yet another concession on the other hand, as far as the FRG itself is concerned, it seems to me that official Bonn is clinging to these 72 missiles for the reason, to some extent, that the ruling coalition wants to pay tribute to its right wing, to the forces known in the FRG as the steel helmets, because the progress of the Soviet-U.S. talks along the path of disarmament, and, in general, the opening of a path toward a new realistic and creative mode of thought in international politics, all this is arousing great displeasure among the reactionary forces in the FRG, and all means are fair, as they say.

[Tsoppi] But don't you think it also signifies a desire on the part of the forces you've been talking about to get their hands on nuclear weapons, which in principle, West Germany is banned from possessing?

[Grigoryev] The official word from Bonn is that: We are not a nuclear power, we don't want these nuclear weapons, and we do not formally possess them.

[Tsoppi] It was not for nothing that Comrade Shevardnadze asked the question: How and by what right does this third country -- that is, the Federal Republic of Germany -- possess nuclear weapons? As far as we are aware, it has neither the legal nor the moral right to do so.

[Charikov] Certainly not. And that fact is being pointed out by no less considerable political forces in the FRG itself: Above all, the main opposition force, the Social Democrats, who...

[Tsoppi, interrupting] The Greens have demanded that they should interrupt the recess and hold...

[Grigoryev, interrupting] Yes, hold a special debate in the Bundestag. A great many democratic organizations, including the press, are urging that the FRG should not obstruct the way. In the coalition, too, there are forces. I liked what a good friend of mine, Herbert (Straten) wrote. He's the editor -- foreign editor -- of NEUE RUHRZEITUNG. He's often been to Moscow and keeps a close watch on our affairs. Anyway, he wrote that Bonn should not be preening itself with the nuclear feathers of the U.S. eagle. That's both well said and, actually...

[Tsoppi, interrupting] Yes, it's a very vivid phrase.

[Charikov] I'd like to continue your train of thought, Aleksey Nikolayevich, and quote another member of the Social Democratic Party of the FRG, the deputy chairman of the party's faction in the Bundestag, Horst Ehmke. He contributed an article -- or rather, an extended political essay -- to the U.S. WORLD POLICY JOURNAL. Here's what he writes: Instead of enthusiastically welcoming the Soviet Union's acceptance of NATO's own zero proposal, the NATO functionaries have reacted to it with caution and even suspicion, bringing out one reservation after another and ultimately stipulating a new condition, concerning the retention of the 72 Pershing-A [as heard] missiles in the FRG. They've even claimed that Gorbachev's assent to the double-zero option was another Soviet trick, with the object of turning Europe into a nuclear-free zone, detaching it from the United States, and splitting the alliance. As soon as it became clear that there was a possibility of concluding an agreement on medium-range [promezhutochnoy dalnosti] nuclear forces, official circles in the Western alliance -- meaning NATO -- began to talk about compensatory measures: deploying sea-based cruise missiles, increasing the number of aircraft capable of carrying nuclear weapons, and so on and so forth.

[Tsoppi] You know, all the same, I think in our time, which is a time not only of new thinking but also of new mutual trust, we've had enough of seeking the enemy, finding the enemy, exposing the enemy and trying to win the enemy over to our point of view. I think we're all bound together by the same fate on this planet, and our present philosophy in foreign policy is based on precisely that premise because we are quite openly proposing that nothing should be left that could get out of the control of the state possessing it, nothing, whether it be space, or nuclear weapons, or nuclear explosions, or chemical weapons. We invite scientists and inspectors, we invite them not only to our nuclear explosions, which we are today forced to carry out because our moratorium met with no response in the form of a reciprocal moratorium by the United States. We even invite them to come to the area where we have a Soviet military installation concerned with chemical weapons so they can see what we're producing and then come to the site near Chapayevsk where we are now building a works for the destruction of chemical weapons, to see that for themselves as well. We consider it

obligatory that inspectors from other countries should be present at all launchings of intercontinental space projectiles [snaryady]. In other words, we're leaving not a single loophole, either for ourselves or for the others, when it comes to establishing total trust on the path of disarmament. It's worth noticing, I think, that this also represents an evolution of our own views: It's a big change in our own attitude to the problem of verification [kontrol], which is actually what the reminder...

[Grigoryev, interrupting] Since we are talking about restructuring, talking about the new thinking in international affairs...

[Charikov, interrupting] It must find expression in some changes of attitude on our own part, in our own approaches...

[Grigoryev, interrupting] Of course.

[Tsoppi] We are not just appealing to the others for probity and honesty. We are saying: Our doors are open to you. You are welcome -- come and verify! If there is something you do not believe, check it. But they are drawing up -- this is something the President of the United States is still very good at -- drawing up some sort of antithesis, drawing up, well, making new attempts to engender new suspicions about the Soviet Union.

[Charikov] Well, if we are speaking about trust, then I would just like to say a couple of words. Indeed, there is virtually no shortage of signs of trust at the moment. This is being admitted by top U.S. politicians. Such phrases are being spoken from time to time, and they cannot help being said because our steps to strengthen trust are so obvious and so, if I may put it this way, impact-making, that it is impossible to simply not talk about them or not take them into consideration.

[Tsoppi] Nevertheless, Reagan is always trying to spoil his reputation. In this television address that you spoke about, Igor Pavlovich, he said the following, despite all his fine words: The Soviets are having talks with us because we are conducting these talks from a position of strength. In other words, the same old approach again. Yes, that is a typical feature of U.S. foreign policy that may be traced back over decades. They believe that it is only by force that a partner can be induced to speak about serious things.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1630

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR: WEST GERMAN, SOVIET TRADE UNIONS BACK DOUBLE-ZERO

PM061015 Moscow TRUD in Russian 1 Aug 87 p 3

["Joint Statement on Visit to USSR by Delegation of German Trade Union Federation (FRG)" -- TRUD headline]

[Excerpts] An official delegation of the German Trade Union Federation [DGB] Federal Board headed by E. Breit, DGB chairman, was in the USSR 25 through 31 July 1987 at the invitation of the AUCCTU. The delegation included I. Blettel and H. Teitzel, members of the DGB Federal Board Executive Committee, and E. Kristoffersen, chief of the DGB Foreign Department.

The DGB delegation was received by A.F. Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. In the course of the meeting questions of mutual interest were discussed. V.S. Shaposhnikov, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, took part in the conversation. Talks took place between the DGB delegation and a Soviet trade union delegation composed of the following: S.A. Shalayev, chairman of the AUCCTU; V.M. Mishin, G.F. Sukhoruchenkova, and G.I. Yanayev, secretaries of the AUCCTU; M.V. Ikharlova, chairman of the Textile and Light Industry Workers Union Central Committee; and B.A. Aberyanov, chief of the AUCCTU International Department.

A detailed exchange of opinions on the world situation was conducted which revealed the coincidence or proximity of the sides' positions and views on a number of most important international issues. The AUCCTU and DGB delegations stressed the objective need to affirm in international affairs the new thinking oriented toward peace and rejecting wars, both nuclear and conventional. They support all steps designed to remove the threat of nuclear war and create an effective system of universal security. In this connection they advocated adopting the "double-zero" option," which may become an important step on the way to ending the arms race. This goal would be facilitated, in the opinion of both sides, by forbidding the militarization of space, eliminating all types of weapons of mass destruction, including chemical and bacteriological weapons, immediately ending nuclear testing, and reducing conventional armaments and forces to a level of sufficiency necessary for defense.

The talks were held in a frank [otkrovennyy], friendly atmosphere and, in the opinion of their participants, were mutually useful.

/9604

CSO: 5200/1620

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

TASS: U.S., FRG COOPERATE ON RAM SYSTEM

LD040828 Moscow TASS in English 0703 GMT 4 Aug 87

[Text] Washington August 4 TASS--U.S. Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger and FRG Defence Minister Manfred Woerner signed here on Monday an agreement on joint production of the "Rolling Airframe Missile" system, designed by naval specialists of the United States and the FRG.

"Ram" is an anti-cruise missile system, the Pentagon said in its press release.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1630

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

IZVESTIYA: NATO PLANS NEW NUCLEAR ARMS IF INF ACCORD REACHED

PM041023 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Aug 87 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "NATO: In the Event of Agreement"]

[Text] London, 3 Aug--Britain and the other NATO countries are nurturing plans to site new nuclear arms in West Europe in the event of the possible conclusion of a Soviet-U.S. agreement to eliminate medium-range and operational and tactical missiles.

Reporting this, THE SUNDAY TIMES newspaper writes that in Brussels last week ranking representatives of the NATO states examined a military report containing recommendations that an additional number of nuclear-capable F-111 fighter-bombers be sited in the British Isles and that the NATO countries should strive to be granted sea-launched nuclear cruise missiles. A special group of ranking figures, the newspaper stresses, will present its ideas to the alliance defense ministers at the end of the year.

The newspaper explains this behind-the-scenes-maneuvering by citing the NATO strategists' "alarm" that "gaps" will appear in the West European nuclear arsenal as a result of the elimination of this category of U.S. nuclear means. However, THE SUNDAY TIMES stresses, they are alarmed most of all by the fact that the destruction of the Pershing 2 missiles will remove the speediest means of inflicting a nuclear strike.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1630

MOSCOW ON NATO PLANS TO 'UPGRADE' ARMS IN EVENT OF INF DEAL

LD051800 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 5 Aug 87

[From "The World Today" program presented by Valeriy Korzin]

[Text] The present world situation is typified by the fact that increasingly all sorts of people on earth understand that the arms race must be ended. The position of the Soviet Union, which has cleared the way to reaching a Soviet-U.S. accord on the global elimination of two classes of nuclear weapons, medium-range missiles and operational and tactical missiles -- this position of ours clearly confirms the real possibility of reaching an agreement in disarmament.

But the opponents of detente are working the more actively. Today it is already difficult just to say no in response to the peace initiatives from Moscow and the capitals of the other socialist countries. So they are trying to work by the back door. NATO, for example, is urgently working out plans to upgrade weapons in the event that medium-range missiles are suddenly destroyed. Just a few days ago high-ranking representatives of the North Atlantic bloc states were discussing in Brussels a report that recommends, in the event of a Soviet-U.S. treaty being concluded, to site [razmestit], for example, in the British Isles additional F-111 fighter-bombers. They are capable of carrying nuclear warheads. This same report also envisages equipping NATO countries with sea-based nuclear cruise missiles. So they are trying to replace one means of waging war with others.

Other facts also show that the Pentagon generals and their allies do not want to heed the demand of the time and that the policy of dealing from a position of strength is not taking on any changes. A representative of the U.S. Defense Department, for example, officially reported that in August and September it is intended to hold major strategic exercises codenamed "Reforger-87." Such exercises are being held for the 19th time now. But it is symptomatic that it is precisely now, when the prerequisites are being created for reducing tension in the world, for the signing of a Soviet-U.S. agreement, that the maneuvers will be held on a previously unprecedented scale. They will work on transferring U.S. troops to West Europe in case of emergency. Already on 13 August military hardware will start being loaded on vessels. Some 34,000 U.S. soldiers and officers will play at war together with 80,000 servicemen from the NATO countries who will also take part in the "Certain Strike-87" field exercise.

The U.S. Defense Department has decided to return to being armed with air bombs with the most powerful nuclear charge equal to 9 megatonnes. Such bombs were first deployed [razvernuty] on B-52 bombers by the Pentagon in 1962. Then they were removed from the weaponry and now we have them once again returning to the arsenal. Symptomatic again, you will agree.

Of course, all of this cannot fail to raise doubts about the sincerity of the numerous peace-loving declarations of the Washington leaders.

/9604

CSO: 5200/1620

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR: NATO UK EXERCISES SIGN OF BUILDING 'NUCLEAR MUSCLE'

PM111255 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Aug 87 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent A. Maslennikov dispatch: "'Playing' With Cruise Missiles"]

[Text] London, 10 Aug -- NATO command continues to build the military bloc's nuclear muscle just as if there were no talks on eliminating medium-range and operational and tactical missiles. This is the inescapable conclusion to be drawn from the military exercises being held on British territory, exercises which are increasing in frequency and scale all the time.

British antinuclear campaigners have recorded that convoys of military vehicles have left the Greenham Common Air Force Base at least twice in the last 2 weeks carrying the first time seven launchers and cruise missiles, the second time eight. The number of launchers carried in a convoy had not previously exceeded four.

Protesting at the dangerous military exercises, British peace campaigners have blocked the path of a convoy three times. During the protest action two women even handcuffed themselves to a cruise-missile transporter. The British police detachments escorting such transporters have arrested a number of demonstrators.

Work is in full swing at Molesworth, Cambridgeshire, another cruise missile base. Recently peace campaigners have also recorded the movement of trucks carrying cruise missiles in that area. A British Defense Ministry spokesman stated that whatever events might have occurred in the political sphere the British and American military command intend to complete the work started and prepare the base for the siting of 64 cruise missiles in accordance with previously outlined plans.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1630

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

IZVESTIYA ON FRENCH CALL FOR NEUTRON BOMBS IN FRG

PM111325 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Aug 87 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent Yu. Kovalenko "Pertinent Remarks": "Keys to the Neutron Bomb"]

[Text] Paris -- In one of its latest issues the Paris weekly L'EXPRESS carried a photograph showing the Champs Elysees military parade on Bastille Day, with a caption reading: "When will a French-West German brigade parade along it?" (It has been reported that the decision to create such a brigade has already been made in Paris and Bonn.)

Without waiting for that day to come, former French Defense Ministers Pierre Messmer and Charles Hernu have come out with a new initiative designed to assist the further strengthening of military bonds between the two countries. They have proposed that, if French neutron weapons were to get into series production, such weapons should be deployed in West Germany and the FRG be given access to them. "If the French Hades missiles with a 340 km range, which are due to replace the Pluton missiles, are to be used as neutron bomb delivery vehicles, they ought to be deployed on FRG territory," C. Hernu declared in an interview with West Berlin's TAGESZEITUNG. "If I were the French Government, I would have no hesitation in handing the key to Bonn and Paris at the proper time." P. Messmer has also spoken along similar lines.

Some people on the banks of the Seine would like to see the keys handed over as soon as possible because, in C. Hernu's words, "an agreement between France and the FRG on the use of tactical nuclear weapons is an important task for the future president" (the elections are not all that far off -- in May 1988). Everything indicates that the position of the military department's former chief is also shared by incumbent Defense Minister A. Giraud who, according to L'EXPRESS, would like to "one way or another" get the FRG involved with nuclear weapons.

Local observers assume that socialist C. Hernu and P. Messmer, chairman of the group of National Assembly deputies from the right-wing party Rally for the Republic, have been assigned the mission of testing the ground. In actual fact, their initiative was not all that unexpected. The thesis that French interests are now no longer limited to just the defense of the "hexagon" (as France is at times referred to) has been promoted increasingly often in recent years. People in ruling circles are increasingly active in advocating an expansion of the French nuclear deterrence zone of action and its extension over the FRG.

The recently adopted military program for 1987-1991 testifies that Paris is banking on the modernization of nuclear forces. By 1992 France's "ocean-based strategic forces" will count 400 warheads. Hades missiles will be deployed by 1993 and by 1996 the nuclear arsenals will be augmented by the C-4 missile which, in experts' opinion, will replace the U.S. Pershing-2's. A. Giraud perceives this buildup of nuclear potential as "French people's readiness to participate in Europe's defense." And one of the landmarks of "Eurodefense" now being laid by Paris will evidently be the deployment of neutron weapons in the FRG.

In L'HUMANITE's opinion, the prospects of their deployment in the FRG -- with work on the creation [sozdaniye] of the neutron bomb already completed and the only thing left to do being to start series production -- look like an attempt to sabotage the Soviet-U.S. talks on the elimination of "Euromissiles" and raise yet another obstacle across the path to the achievement of disarmament in Europe. W. Stuetzle, director of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, stressed that the proposal by the two former ministers can only have negative consequences for the disarmament talks. For its part, the FRG Social Democratic Party has also come out against the deployment of neutron bombs on West German territory and the "double key" system.

This latest initiative by P. Messmer and C. Hernu, who continue to play an important role in the country's political life, causes concern. Do people in the West really and sincerely wish to achieve disarmament, or are they simply calculating on continuing the course of nuclear confrontation by replacing one missile by another?

/9604

CSO: 5200/1620

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

TASS REPORTS ANTIWAR DEMONSTRATION AT FRG EMBASSY IN MOSCOW

LD121240 Moscow TASS in English 1219 GMT 12 Aug 87

[Text] Moscow August 12 TASS -- Representatives of anti-war organizations from Europe and North America who took part in the international peace cruise along the Dnieper river staged a demonstration in front of the West German Embassy here today to demand the withdrawal of all nuclear weapons from Europe and the dismantling of Pershing-1A missiles in the Federal Republic of Germany.

The demonstrators handed over to the embassy a statement from the West German peace campaigners, backed by all participants in the cruise.

The statement welcomed the stance on the process and course of talks on medium- and shorter-range missiles set out in Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze's speech in Geneva.

The Soviet Government, for its part, created conditions for eliminating and scrapping all land-based medium- and shorter-range missiles, the statement said. Responsibility for the course and success of the talks on disarmament rested directly and unconditionally on the governments of the U.S. and the FRG.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1630

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR'S CHERVOV: U.S. ARMS AT MISAWA 'THREATEN' SECURITY

OW160931 Tokyo KYODO in English 0927 GMT 16 Aug 87

[Excerpts] Moscow, Aug. 16 KYODO--Gen. Nikolay Chervov, a senior member of the Soviet Armed Forces' General Staff Office, says American nuclear weapons at the U.S. military base in Misawa, northeast Japan, threaten Soviet security.

In a recent interview with KYODO news service, Gen. Chervov, head of the office's Disarmament and Security Affairs Department, sepcifically referred to 160-170 U.S. F-16 and F-4 aircraft stationed at Misawa, saying the planes can be equipped with nuclear weapons capable of reaching coastal areas in the Soviet Far East.

The general said the Soviet Union sees itself as being surrounded by U.S. nuclear arms and that the U.S. base at Misawa is also unhealthy for Japan.

Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev's earlier proposal to the United States for the abolition of nuclear arms in Asia should be taken to include the U.S. nuclear arms at Misawa, Chervov said.

Gorbachev's proposal called for a simultaneous scrapping of 100 Soviet intermediate-range nuclear missile warheads in the Soviet Asian region and 100 U.S. INF missile warheads. Gorbachev's proposal referred to U.S. nuclear power deployed in South Korea, the Philippines and the Indian Ocean, but not to those at the Misawa base.

Gen. Chervov also said that the 100 Soviet INF missile warheads in its Asian region are targetted at U.S. nuclear power deployed in the Asia-Pacific region.

The general said the Soviet Union is proposing the scrapping of its 100 warheads in the Asian region in exchange for 100 American warheads on the U.S. mainland, despite the nuclear threat posed by U.S. forces in the Asia-Pacific region.

The Soviet military will also expand the "glasnost (openness)" policy advocated by Gorbachev, Chervov said.

Under the principle of openness, the Soviet Union wants to exchange basic nuclear arms-related data with the United States and its NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) allies during the Soviet-U.S. disarmament negotiations, he said.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1630

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR'S PRIMAKOV: REDUCTION AGREEMENT 'WITHIN THIS YEAR'

OW120609 Tokyo KYODO in English 0556 GMT 12 Aug 87

[Text] Moscow, Aug. 11 KYODO -- The Soviet Union and the United States will most likely reach an agreement on reduction or elimination of intermediate and shorter-range nuclear forces within this year, an aide of Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev said Tuesday.

In an interview with KYODO news service, Yevgeniy Primakov, director of the Institute of World Economics and International Relations, said Soviet and U.S. positions have become closer owing to Soviet concessions during two years of nuclear reduction talks with the U.S., and especially since Gorbachev made a new offer of a "global zero option." proposing the elimination of medium and shorter-range missiles from Asia and Europe.

But he said that the success of nuclear reduction talk will depend on the outcome of the meeting between U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz and Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze scheduled for September.

Primakov also said the Soviet Union is optimistic about a superpower summit.

Viktor Karpov, a director of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, told a news conference Tuesday guarantees will be needed to ensure that missiles are not reequipped with nuclear warheads once they have been eliminated.

/9604

CSO: 5200/1620

CHEMICAL, BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

SOVIET CD DELEGATE NAZARKIN ON CHEMICAL ARMS

New Verification Proposal

PM181516 Paris LE FIGARO in French 17 Aug 87 p 5

[Interview with Yuriy Nazarkin, head of the Soviet delegation at the Geneva conference, by Pierre Bocev in Paris--date not given]

[Text] [Bocev] What is the essence of the USSR's new proposals?

[Nazarkin] We base our proposals on the principle of the need for compulsory inspections on demand without any possibility of refusing. This is the key question because it is linked with the solution of all the other problems. If suspicion exists, any state that has signed the future convention banning chemical weapons must be able to demand an on-site inspection without the suspected state having any right to refuse this inspection.

But this raises a major problem: how to avoid revealing military secrets that have an immediate connection with chemical weapons during such an inspection. Just imagine, take an extreme example, that we suspected the United States of stocking chemical weapons in the National Security Council building in Washington: If we demanded an on-site inspection inside the building, we would learn secrets that have nothing to do with the real object of our demand. Hence our proposal for "alternative measures": external visual observation, taking samples from the surrounding area, and, if that does not suffice, an inspection inside the building nonetheless, and this is what the Americans call "managed conduct." In short, the establishment of a real code of conduct under the auspices of a technical secretariat which would operate like the IAI in Vienna. There should be no more than 48 hours between the demand for an inspection and the start of verification, on the understanding that the state that demanded the inspection ought to compensate for any material damage, such as the revelation of trade secrets.

We are prepared to discuss all of this, but the really important thing is the inability to refuse an inspection if suspicion exists.

[Bocev] Just 1 year ago, the USSR did not even admit that it had chemical weapons. It is now making proposals, some of which go further than the Western countries would like.

[Nazarkin] This is practical evidence of the policy of "glasnost" pursued by Mikhail Gorbachev. You can see it yourself.

[Bocev] So, what is the size of the USSR's stocks of chemical weapons? West estimates range from 200,000 tonnes to 700,000 tonnes.

[Nazarkin] What are the figures for the Americans? There are no official figures. I have not seen any figures for the Soviet Union. I do not know how big the USSR stocks are. In any case, I cannot comment on these figures.

Confers With French

LD172001 Moscow TASS in English 1938 GMT 17 Aug 87

[Text] Paris August 17 TASS -- Soviet-French consultations were held here today. Questions of the total prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons were discussed.

The Soviet side explained in detail the new initiatives in this field advanced by the USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs Eduard Shevardnadze at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva on August 6, 1987.

The consultations were held by the USSR representative at the Conference on Disarmament Ambassador Yuriy Nazarkin, the USSR Charge d'Affaires Ad Interim in France O.V. Krivonogov, Deputy Director of the Political Department of the French Ministry of External Relations Bengit D'Aboville and the French representative at the Conference on Disarmament Pierre Morel.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1629

SHEVARDNADZE CD SPEECH STRESSES IMPORTANCE OF VERIFICATION

Moscow APN DAILY REPORT in English 10 Aug 87 pp 1-4

[Article by APN Correspondent Enver Mamedov under the rubric "News and Views":
"The USSR Is for Strict and Effective Disarmament Verification"]

[Text] Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, speaking at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, singled out the issue of verification as one of vital concerns to the world community. The reason why he did so was because experience down the years has shown that faithful fulfillment or even interpretation of treaty provisions matter most in the long run. We remember only too well what contemptuous comments on international accords as "scraps of paper" have led to. Humanity remembers how the step-by-step violation of the treaties concluded after the World War One allowed Nazi Germany to build up a mammoth military potential, which ended in stupendous destruction and loss of millions of lives. So Eduard Shevardnadze was perfectly justified in laying special emphasis on verification, its principles and corollaries. Of course, there are two lines of approach to the subject--one of high-sounding speculation about the verification issue and one of down-to-earth action to bring about genuine and effective verification.

The only kind of verification that is seen as true and valid in the Soviet Union is that which unquestionably and unfailingly ensures that weapons are scrapped, commitments regarding the remaining arms and military activity allowable under appropriate accords honoured, and no bans bypassed by whatever trickery.

Looking back on the document of June 9, 1987, concerning a nuclear weapons test ban, submitted to the Conference on Disarmament, one can see that it contains proposals for a wide range of forms and methods of verification, both national and international. Some of them have already been effectively applied. American scientists with appropriate equipment had been present in the area of a Soviet nuclear test site for a considerable length of time. There is a further accord between the Academy of Sciences of the USSR and our American colleagues about the installation of monitoring devices and an exchange of relevant documents.

The Soviet Foreign Minister proposed setting up an international system of global radiation safety monitoring, involving communication satellites. Apart from monitoring compliance with a nuclear test ban, once it is imposed, such a system could serve to watch air, soil and sea pollution. That would be an extra precaution against all kinds of accidents, like those at nuclear power plants.

Everybody in the Soviet Union and in the rest of the world to-day is anxious to see an agreement to eliminate medium- and shorter-range missiles.

The Soviet Union holds that an agreement to this effect has to be closely tied in to verification measures. These must proceed from information about the missile inventories of the parties concerned. Such information has to be exchanged. But on top of that, it has to be checked through on-site inspections.

There will have to be unfailing supervision over the way the missiles are destroyed and over the dismantling of the manufacturing capacities for them and infrastructure. We suggest setting up such a verification system, Eduard Chevardnadze said, as could make both sides absolutely sure that the accord cannot be bypassed in any way.

What our country deems very important, indeed, indispensable is access to the military installations of the USSR and the US in third countries, where some missiles may be sited.

To sum up, we are opening the territory of the Soviet Union for inspection. Naturally, full confidence implies full reciprocity, witness Stockholm where a materialized principle of confidence was worked out and a new way of political thinking followed. No doubt, we have been pressing and we shall continue to press for this new way of thinking to apply to more than one continent.

One area in which verification can have a particularly important part to play is the effort to prevent an arms race in space. The presence of international inspectors at spaceports at the time of each particular launching is to make sure that no weapons are ever put into space. Moreover, the Soviet Union considers that inspection teams must be constantly present in all test ranges used to launch objects into space and get the requisite information about the projected launchings.

The Soviet Foreign Minister declared that, given a total space strike weapons ban, the USSR would be prepared to allow inspection of its depots, industrial facilities, laboratories, experimentation centres, etc.

The Soviet Union's latest bold approach to the issue of verification finds most striking expression in its proposals for the elimination of chemical weapons and their stocks. The USSR will be prepared to do its utmost for the long-awaited convention on the subject to be adopted as soon as possible. Furthermore, the Soviet Union will be proceeding at chemical arms control talks from the need for an indispensable legal provision to enforce the principle of

mandatory inspections upon request. By way of fostering a climate of confidence, the USSR is inviting the parties to the chemical weapons talks to visit the Soviet military installation at Shikhany to see samples of our chemical munitions and get an idea of the techniques we suggest to destroy them. In due course, experts will be invited to a special facility under construction in the area of Chapayevsk to scrap chemical weapons.

Concluding, the Soviet Foreign Minister called for a reinvigoration of the forums debating disarmament issues. Eduard Shevardnadze stressed that the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva must not keep out of nuclear arms control either. An issue that is crucial to the destiny of the human race must not be left just to a few Powers. It is unfair to bar non-nuclear states from having their say in resolving this problem because the nuclear threat cuts across national boundaries and ideological differences. It will recognize no neutrality, nor have mercy on anyone.

(APN, August 9. In full.)

/8309

CSO: 5200/1628

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

SOVIET CD DELEGATE ON VERIFYING TEST BAN, SPACE ARMS PACTS

PM141021 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Aug 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "At the Disarmament Conference"]

[Text] Geneva, 13 Aug -- At the Conference on Disarmament being held here, immense interest was aroused by the Soviet initiatives set out in the 6 August speech by E.A. Shevardnadze, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR foreign minister, at conference plenary session. Explaining the initiatives in his speech today, USSR delegation head Yu.k. Nazarkin dwelled on two issues: banning nuclear tests and preventing an arms race in outer space.

A special group of scientific experts, the creation of which was proposed on 6 August would be able to prepare scientifically substantiated recommendations on the structure and functions of the verification system for any possible agreement on not conducting nuclear weapons tests. [paragraph continues]

The group would be able to examine all aspects of verification as they relate to one another, including exchange of seismic data, on-site inspection, and the standard specifications of seismic stations. We propose the Conference on Disarmament adopt before the end of its 1987 session a decision in principle on setting up the proposed group at the beginning of the next session. Allow me to point out in this regard that the Soviet Union has proposed creating an international system of global verification of radiation safety using space communications channels. The creation of the system could take place even before the treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear tests comes into force.

On preventing an arms race in outer space, the USSR delegation head noted that the Soviet Union sees the task of preventing the arms race from spreading to outer space as one of today's most urgent tasks and intends to seek a strict universal ban on placing any kind of weapon in space.

Of course, an agreement on this matter is inconceivable without reliable verification. It was pointed out in this regard that on 17 March the Soviet delegation proposed that the possibility be examined of setting up a system of international verification to prevent placing any type of weapon in outer space that would envisage establishing an international protectorate. The USSR proposes that a start be made now, without waiting for the conclusion of a corresponding agreement on space on creating a verification system so that it can be activated as soon as possible. The inspection could begin shortly before an object to be launched into space is installed on the carrier rocket [raketa-nositel] or other launch device [sredstvo vyvedeniya]. Moreover, the proposed verification system would provide for the permanent presence of inspection groups at all space launch sites.

USSR'S TATARNIKOV HITS NATO STANCE IN CSCE

PM021649 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Jul 87 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "At the Vienna Meeting"]

[Text] Vienna, 28 Jul--Today the Vienna meeting of CSCE participant states' representatives was presented with an analysis of the results of the talks on military aspects of security by Major-General V.M. Tatarnikov, member of the Soviet delegation.

He drew attention to the fact that NATO countries are dragging out work to draft the section on military issues in the Vienna meeting's final document, including the section on disarmament problems. They submitted their proposals on these important issues only at the end of the current round of talks. However, these NATO documents do not constitute an adequate response to the proposals submitted in Vienna by the socialist countries.

The Warsaw Pact states propose a parallel discussion of confidence-building and disarmament measures. In particular, the development of confidence-building measures in terms of not only the activity of ground forces but also that of air and naval forces; likewise the development of substantial measures to limit the scale of military exercises, which should apply to the territory of all member states, including the United States and Canada. Another important aspect of the talks is disarmament.

V.M. Tatarnikov also demonstrated the contradictory stand taken by NATO countries at unofficial consultations between the Warsaw Pact states and NATO countries. They say they are in favor of strengthening stability and security in Europe but in practice they are opposed to any reduction in the main destabilizing components of the sides' military potentials--tactical nuclear weapons and tactical strike aircraft.

The Soviet spokesman voiced the hope that by the next round of the Vienna meeting the NATO countries will have worked out a realistic approach to resolving these urgent problems that will make it possible to successfully conclude the talks on military aspects of European security.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1628

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

USSR'S KASHLEV ON MEETINGS TO FOLLOW VIENNA CSCE

LD310910 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0400 GMT 31 Jul 87

[Oleg Blinov presents reports by radio correspondents and news agencies from abroad]

[Text] [Blinov] I shall start from the Austrian capital, where the conclusion of the meeting on problems of disarmament and the development of all-round relations between European countries was planned for today. But, as our correspondent Viktor Mikhayev reported, evidently only its latest stage is being concluded. This is what he was told in an interview by Ambassador Kashlev, head of the Soviet delegation:

[Begin Kashlev recording] With the support of the neutral countries, the socialist countries succeeded in predetermining the question to the effect that after Vienna there be two important talks. First the Conference on Confidence-building Measures, Security and Disarmament, was continued, and second new talks were started on reducing armed forces in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals. We insisted that in both the former and the latter talks all 35 states should take part. The NATO member states are pursuing the line that the second talks should, strictly speaking, be talks between blocs, so this issue has not yet been resolved. A few other fundamental issues have also not yet been resolved. Under our program not only conventional armed forces but also the tactical nuclear weapons making up their structure should be subjected to reduction. NATO is against this, so far. So here, too, a lengthy struggle lies ahead. [end recording]

/8309

CSO: 5200/1628

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

SPANISH PRESS INTERVIEW WITH GRIBKOV ON DEFENSE POLICY

PM141320 Madrid DIARIO 16 in Spanish 4 Aug 87 p 12

[Interview with General Anatoliy Gribkov, Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces first deputy commander in chief, by Miguel Angel Liso in Moscow; date not given]

[Excerpts] Moscow--"Please tell the Spanish people that the Warsaw Pact wants peace and that we will never start a war. Our policy is defensive. Make this quite clear."

These remarks were made by one of the top Warsaw Pact commanders, Anatoliy Gribkov, the military organizations' second-in-command, first deputy commander of the Joint Armed Forces of the eastern bloc countries' alliance, in his first interview with a Spanish newspaper.

General Anatoliy Gribkov, 68, seemed rather distant and cool at the start of our conversation, also attended by his two aides, but he gradually showed signs of greater friendliness. Above all he stressed repeatedly that the Warsaw Pact does not want war and that its military might is justified.

"It may seem ridiculous to you for me to tell you, as a soldier, that I do not want war and that I am in favor of the elimination of the blocs. However, as soldiers, we must also be prepared to repel any NATO aggression and must not allow it to take us by surprise. I assure you that we have sufficient strength to repel any aggression."

[Liso] General, the NATO countries use the same argument as you to strengthen their military might. Who is telling the truth?

[Gribkov] We provide evidence of what we say. We have decided not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and have withdrawn troops and tanks from Europe, but NATO has still not responded. On the contrary, it is stepping up its military forces in West Europe; therefore the ball is in NATO's court, not ours. Obviously we will never take the step of unilaterally dissolving the Warsaw Pact.

[Liso] From your viewpoint what is the correlation of forces between NATO and the Warsaw Pact?

[Gribkov] The correlation is balanced in both human and material resources. Although NATO has advantages in some kinds of weapons, the Warsaw Pact has them in others. We have an advantage over NATO in tanks and tactical and operational missiles. NATO has superiority over us in antitank weapons, combat helicopters, aircraft, and warships; the discrepancies are due to historical and geographical factors, but they compensate for one another and balance out, though NATO tries to portray these differences as an overall superiority on the Warsaw Pact's part.

"Against Us" [subhead]

The deputy commander of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces stressed that a "nuclear free Europe would be preferable to a nuclear Europe" and that they therefore attach great importance to the USSR-U.S. negotiations on the reduction of nuclear missiles. He said, however, that the Americans' and NATO countries' stance on not carrying out fair reduction could impede the attainment of a comprehensive agreement.

According to the general, conventional arms reduction is also crucially important with a view to reaching "a level where neither side has the means to mount a surprise attack or to carry out general offensive operations."

On the subject of Spain, General Gribkov said that our country's entry into the Atlantic Alliance did not surprise him since the Americans had had their bases at Torrejon and Rota for many years. "It is an additional participation," he added, "since obviously the F-16 aircraft at Torrejon or the submarines at Rota are ranged against us."

[Liso] General, even if it did not surprise you, what does Spain's entry into NATO mean for the Warsaw Pact?

[Gribkov] Spain itself poses no threat to the Warsaw Pact but it does participate in the creation of such a threat by allying with other states. Its armed forces are a significant complement to NATO political leaderships plan to use Spanish territory to stockpile American nuclear weapons and it is wished to adapt Spanish territory to the role of a kind of bridge to regions outside NATO's area of responsibility. All this means that Spain's integration into NATO complicates the military strategic situation on the European Continent and in the Mediterranean. We hail Spain's decision to adhere to the nuclear nonproliferation accord as a very important move for the whole of Europe.

Response to United States [subhead]

General Gribkov's office is decorated with fine woods and drapes, with portraits of Lenin, Gorbachev, and new Defense Minister Dmitriy Yazov on the walls. At one end of the room is a huge globe and the general is convinced that in the event of a war the world would be destroyed.

According to Gribkov, the greatest danger at present in the arms race is the U.S. SDI antimissile space defense plan. "We are opposed to SDI," he said, "because it is a bad thing for the entire world. The United States is seeking to deploy a space shield over its country to diminish the other side's retaliatory strike capability, appropriating the right to deliver a nuclear first strike with impunity. Of course the Soviet Union will be able to issue an adequate response to the U.S. actions but SDI would threaten to destabilize the military strategic situation by undermining many accords of vital importance to the cause of peace."

/8309

CSO: 5200/1628

NUCLEAR TESTING, FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

IZVESTIYA COMMENTATOR ON ASIAN SECURITY, TESTING, REGIONAL NFZ'S

PM311645 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Aug 87 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by IZVESTIYA political observer V. Matveyev: "From the Urals to the Hawaiian Islands..."]

[Text] In a few days' time, outside the shell of a building in Hiroshima incinerated by the first atom bomb, at the monument to those who died in the bombing, there will be the traditional ceremony of addressing the past and the future. Those who were incinerated in the whirlwind of fire will not return, but it is within the power of people and governments to prevent calamities of whose consequences even first-grade schoolchildren are now aware.

Mass destruction weapons hang over the whole of mankind like a sword of Damocles, but it is in the expanses of the Asian-Pacific region that they have been tested and refined over the decades since the war. It was there, on Korean and Vietnamese soil, that the most serious threat existed of the use of these weapons by the Pentagon. It did not come to that, not because reason prevailed in the minds of the people who conceived those plans, but as a result of other factors which are to be found in the real correlation of forces in the world.

Hiroshima and Nagasaki remain in the annals of history the only targets of atom bomb raids, but who can guarantee the future in conditions of a continuing nuclear arms race? In conditions where new, albeit tiny territories in the Pacific are becoming test sites for experimental explosions of French nuclear weapons? Finally, in conditions where an explosive situation could be created in the Asian-Pacific region if still-unresolved disputes and interstate conflicts are accompanied by an unbridled arms buildup? The anxiety of Pakistan's neighbors in connection with reports about work there on nuclear weapons is just one such fact.

Answering a question posed by publisher and chief editor of the Indonesian paper MERDEKA B.M. Diah about the most urgent and feasible measures to ease tension in Asia and the Pacific, M.S. Gorbachev said: "Above all it is necessary to talk again and again about nuclear weapons."

Accommodating the Asian countries and acknowledging their anxiety, the Soviet Union is prepared to destroy all its medium-range missiles in the Asian part of the country as well. On condition that the United States also destroys its medium-range missiles on its territory. Operation and tactical

missiles would also be eliminated. Our country is prepared to pledge not to increase the number of nuclear weapon carrying aircraft in the Asian part of the USSR as long as the United States does not site in the area extra nuclear weapons capable of reaching USSR territory. During the conversation with Indonesian journalists the CPSU Central Committee general secretary made some other constructive proposals aimed at radically improving the situation in the Asian-Pacific region.

So, after Europe, the outline of a Soviet-American accord on the elimination of entire categories of nuclear missiles is taking shape in the Asian-Pacific region as well. This should make it easier to reach an agreement on the proper verification and inspection measures, since no loophole will remain for such categories of weapons. And, of course, the prospects of progress toward a nuclear-free world will become more, not less, real.

It is a matter not of eliminating individual hotbeds of war, but of eradicating from the practice of international relations violence in all its forms and the threat of violence and of renouncing war, both nuclear and conventional. This is the essence of the concept of all-embracing, universal security, which should be built on consideration of the legitimate interests of every country and all peoples within the framework of large geographical regions.

We do not aspire--and cannot aspire--to a monopoly role in creating favorable currents in the international atmosphere, but we consider it our duty to contribute as much as possible to what is being elaborated, to what is coming to fruition naturally among the public and at government level in other countries.

The idea of a nuclear-free world has recently been given new content by the enterprising actions of small, and not so small, states in Asia and the Pacific. At the moment these are just limited steps, but it may be said that they clear the way to larger-scale decisions. The countries of the South Pacific formulated a treaty on the creation of a nuclear-free zone there. The question of creating such zones in Southeast Asia and the Korean peninsula is now on the agenda. The idea of declaring the Indian Ocean a peace zone has become firmly rooted. The Australian and New Zealand governments have been opposing French nuclear tests there for some years now.

Official departments in Washington, London, and Paris would like to make political capital out of the fact that our country supports antinuclear actions in Asia and the Pacific. But who can attribute the position of the present Australian government, for example, in protesting against the detonation of French nuclear devices in the Pacific to "prompting from Moscow?"

The time factor--for the Asian and Pacific states, too--is becoming increasingly critical. The rate of development of military technology is so fast that, as events of the late seventies and early eighties have shown, it is outstripping the process of the arms limitation and reduction talks. There can be no more delay, or else arms of such sophistication will appear that it will be utterly impossible to negotiate the control of them. Furthermore, the appearance of new weapons systems steadily reduces the time and opportunity for politicians to influence events in crisis situations.

Special comment should be made here in connection with the Japanese government's involvement in the Pentagon's space program. The Japanese constitution precludes nuclear status for the country. But Tokyo's ruling circles are making more than just a token contribution: They are becoming involved on a large scale in the preparations in the nuclear sphere by associating themselves with Washington's "strategic defense initiative." In many demonstrations the Japanese people have shown a determination to defend their country's nonnuclear status. And I believe that such determination is strengthened all the more by both our initiatives and the proposals of other states and governments in Asia and the Pacific, aimed at achieving the idea of a world without nuclear weapons.

The 1986 Delhi Declaration on the principles of a world free of nuclear weapons and violence, which the USSR and Indian leaders, expressing the will of over 1 billion people, addressed to all the states of the world, is an inspiring guide both to governments mindful of their responsibility for the fate of peace and to the broad strata of the public.

From Vladivostok to Delhi, and then beyond, to concrete measures for reducing whole categories of nuclear arms on a global scale--all this took place within a single year. We have no intention of beating the drum. There is no justification for that. But it is a fact that it proved possible in a short time to considerably increase the pace of the struggle for a nuclear-free world both on the broadest scale and on a regional scale.

With regard to the Asian and Pacific region, the states there have not often had occasion to think about what unites them. The external imperialist forces urged them not long the path of mutual understanding but of conflict and internal strife. The historic significance of the Vladivostok appeal issued 1 year ago consists in the single fact that it gave those states the impetus to become aware that the common factor which links them is the crucial problem of war and peace.

The diversity of the countries situated in this vast region is an argument not against but in favor of joint steps motivated by concern for the common factor, namely, durable peace and reliable security. That diversity was exploited treacherously in the recent past--and is still being used by the advocates of the "policy of strength"--against the vital interests of this region's peoples. This must not be allowed. The laying of the foundations of indestructible peace in Asia and the Pacific is the most important precondition for good-neighborliness and cooperation on the continent where more than one-half of the world's population lives.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1631

NUCLEAR TESTING, FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS: RADIATION FROM U.S. BLASTS HAS 'DISASTROUS' EFFECTS

LD141641 Moscow TASS in English 1638 GMT 14 Aug 87

["United States Should Abide by the Commitments Assumed"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow August 14 TASS -- TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev comments:

The United States' sharply negative attitude to the Soviet Union's proposal for a total and universal ban on nuclear weapon tests is a key impediment on the way of normalizing international relations and scaling down the threat of a nuclear war.

Nuclear explosions which keep to be conducted through the fault of Washington spur the nuclear arms race and, moreover, have a disastrous impact on the environment and people.

According to the information of the U.S. Department of Energy, 136 cases of radiation spewing out beyond the test site in Nevada after U.S. nuclear tests were recorded by mid 1985. American officials admit that on December 18, 1970, following the underground nuclear blast in Nevada, U.S. airforce aircraft monitored the spread of the radioactive cloud up to the borders with Canada.

The explosion of a nuclear device code-named "Midas Myth" on April 15, 1984 caused the surface of the rock mountain Rainier to collapse and form a crater over five meters deep. One worker was killed and 13 injured.

Nuclear test site operational personnel were exposed to radiation during the U.S. nuclear test "Mighty Oak" on April 10, 1985. The U.S. Department of Energy concealed this incident for several weeks by refuting the reports about the leakage of radioactive substances.

The ejection of radiation as a result of U.S. nuclear tests in Nevada are constantly registered by competent bodies of the Soviet Union outside the national territory of the United States. The current year of 1987 witnessed three cases of the radioactive fallout from U.S. nuclear explosions in non-American territory, which is a flagrant breach of the provisions of the Soviet-U.S. treaty on banning nuclear weapon tests in the three media of 1963.

U.S. nuclear explosions in the atmosphere conducted before 1963 inflicted a damage upon the health of thousands of residents in Micronesia. U.S. and Japanese scientists estimated that forty per cent of the residents of the islands in the area of the Atoll Bikini suffer from grave thyroid gland disorders. Numerous cases of cancer, skin disease and lymphatic system were recorded among residents of Micronesia. At least 40 Japanese fishermen died as a result of the exposure to radiation in the Pacific Ocean.

The 1963 treaty on banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and underwater put up a barrier to the intensive radioactive contamination of the environment. Following 1963, the radiation level on the globe perceptibly dropped. However, scientists now warn that it can be raised considerably as a result of intensive underground tests with the ejection of radioactive substances.

To solve this issue in the interests of mankind, it is necessary that the United States should display at last respect for the agreements signed by it and fulfil not in words but in deed the commitment assumed by it under the 1963 treaty, that is to reach a ban on all test explosions of nuclear weapons once and for all.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1631

NUCLEAR TESTING, FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

SOVIET REACTION TO CHARGES OF LEAKING FROM 2 AUGUST TEST

'Insignificant' Leak, No Fallout

LD151428 Moscow TASS in English 1415 GMT 15 Aug 87

[Text] [No dateline as received] -- In connection with claims circulated by the Western mass media, with the Americans being especially zealous in the effort, that the underground nuclear explosion conducted by the Soviet Union on August 2, 1987, on Novaya Zemlya Island has been accompanied by the release of radioactive debris outside Soviet territory, TASS has this to report:

During the nuclear explosion of Novaya Zemlya Island, all the necessary precautions were taken to rule out radioactive fallout, as required by the Soviet Union's commitments under the 1963 treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water. The population was not subjected to any danger of radiation effects, which has been confirmed by the national control systems of the USSR.

In connection with incoming queries, competent organizations in the USSR have carried out an extra and all-around check, which has showed that after the explosion there took place the leak of an insignificant amount of gaseous products which have not led to the formation of radioactive fallout. This excludes the possibility of radioactive fallout in any state as a result of the underground nuclear explosion on Novaya Zemlya Island.

The Soviet Union attaches great significance to strict and unfailing compliance with the provisions of the 1963 treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, regarding it as an important means of limiting the arms race. Corresponding Soviet organizations have invariably taken all the necessary measures to make certain that the demands made in this international act are met.

Our goal is a general and complete prohibition of nuclear weapon tests. The Soviet Union reaffirms once again its proposal for talks on this issue without delay -- in any form and at any level. It depends first of all on the United States whether nuclear blasts will continue or not. The answer is to be given by it.

Gerasimov Raps West on Reports

LD171058 Moscow TASS in English 1041 GMT 17 Aug 87

[Text] Moscow August 17 TASS -- "The slight increase in the content of radioactive substances in the atmosphere, which was noted on August 12 and which, as has been recognized by experts of Western countries, posed no hazard to the population, was used by Western media to launch a propaganda campaign for the purpose of casting aspersions upon the Soviet Union", Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, said at a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists today.

"The Soviet side was accused almost of violating the Moscow treaty banning the tests of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, in outer space and underwater," he said.

"It is not the first case when attempts are stubbornly made to connect in this or that way any upward deviation in the radiation background of the West of the Soviet Union's borders only with what takes place in our country", Gennadiy Gerasimov went on to say.

"Listening to Western propaganda media one would believe that radioactive winds can blow only from the East, leaving aside the fact, for example, that on August 13 the United States, detonated a powerful nuclear device at the test range in Nevada, and that breakdowns occurred in Britain on August 10 and 12 at nuclear power stations in North Wales and Dumfriesshire respectively."

"An all-round check carried out by Soviet organizations has shown that after the nuclear explosion which was conducted by the Soviet Union on Novaya Zemlya on August 2, there took place the leak of an insignificant amount of gaseous products which did not lead to the formation of radioactive fallout."

"So, the possibility of radioactive fallout in any state as a result of the underground nuclear explosion on Novaya Zemlya Island is fully ruled out."

"The Soviet Union," the spokesman for the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs emphasized, "attaches special importance to strict and undeviating observance of the provisions of the 1963 treaty banning the tests of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, in outer space and underwater. The treaty is viewed as an important means for curbing the arms race and as the first step to complete termination of nuclear tests."

"General and complete ban on tests of nuclear weapons is one of the imperatives of Soviet foreign policy. The unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions, the moratorium which the Soviet Union observed for more than 18 months, is a convincing illustration of the sincerity and consistency of our approach to this issue."

"There was silence at Soviet nuclear test sites for more than 500 days pending similar silence at U.S. proving grounds. The Soviet Union is not to blame in the least that we had to resume tests," Gennadiy Gerasimov emphasized.

"At present the selfsame people who foiled the moratorium are casting aspersions upon our country and are cluttering up the international atmosphere with nonsensical conjectures which are designed, first of all, to camouflage their own disruptive policy."

"The Soviet Union is again reaffirming its proposal immediately to begin talks in any form and with in any composition on general and complete ban on the tests of nuclear weapons", Gennadiy Gerasimov pointed out.

"We are for serious talk about ending the tests of nuclear weapons and are for real steps in this direction. Whether nuclear explosions will be conducted or not depends, first of all, on the United States of America. It is now up to it to come up with a reply".

PRAVDA on U.S. 'Disinformation'

PM191101 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Aug 87 Second Edition p 5

[A. Lyutyy "International Notes": "Who It Profits"]

[Text] In his recent speech at the Geneva disarmament conference, USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze once again focused the world community's attention on the need for the speediest prohibition of nuclear tests. The Soviet Union's position was set forth clearly and unambiguously -- we advocate that nuclear tests recede into the realm of history.

However, a categorical "no" has once again been heard from Washington. This time, however, to ensure that it did not appear just too dissonant against international public opinion, the State Department and certain U.S. mass media have mounted and in recent days have kept up a disinformation campaign alleging that the USSR is violating provisions of the 1963 Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space, and Under Water. It is claimed that the Soviet Union's carrying out a nuclear explosion on Novaya Zemlya Island on 2 August 1987 was accompanied by a discharge of radioactive substances beyond Soviet territory, resulting in increased radioactivity in Scandinavian countries.

A recently published TASS report provided the necessary explanations. At a special briefing in the USSR Foreign Ministry press center, Soviet and foreign journalists received additional information from competent specialists. This information attests that there was absolutely no violation of the Moscow treaty. That document, and particularly Article I, point B, prohibit the carrying out of nuclear tests not only in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water, but also in any other environment if such tests cause radioactive fallout to occur outside the state.

But the small quantity of gaseous products that was discharged into the atmosphere following the 2 August test -- not that this is an exceptional case, for such discharge is observed even from very deep underground explosions -- did not result in the formation of radioactive fallout and, thus, did not constitute a violation of the Moscow treaty.

Moreover, the special aircraft that flew along the borders with Scandinavia from through 7 August, in accordance with the rigid verification that we have established took measurements and recorded absolutely no increase in radioactivity. However, even if you assume that there really was an insignificant increase in background radiation in a number of Scandinavian countries -- an increase which, as these countries themselves admit, poses absolutely no danger to humans -- why must it be ascribed precisely to the Soviet Union? Have there not been accidents at a number of nuclear power stations in West Europe recently? Such an accident occurred in Britain, for example, and at practically the same time as there was talk of increased radioactivity in Scandinavia. Or, following Chernobyl, have people in Western countries decided to ascribe any increase in radioactivity in the Northern Hemisphere to the USSR? If this is so, at the time of the 2 August explosion the wind was blowing not westward but east and south.

Of course, it is a matter not of the wind and weather but of those who make the political weather in Washington today. It is far more convenient for them to make an unsubstantiated accusation against the USSR than to take a step forward on the way to resolving a cardinal problem for mankind -- banning nuclear tests. It is logical to ask the U.S. side: If the United States is so alarmed at the appearance of even insignificant quantities of radioactive products in various parts of the world, would it not be better to dispel this alarm by completely prohibiting nuclear tests, thus ruling out the likelihood of radioactive substances' spread in the atmosphere? If Washington shows such concern in its desire to protect our environment against all pollution, why then does it not respond to the proposal submitted by the USSR at the Geneva disarmament conference to establish an international system of global verification of radiation safety using space lines of communication? With the help of this system, it would be possible not only to enhance the efficiency of verifying the observance of a nuclear test ban, when such a ban is introduced, but also to trace the degree of pollution of the atmosphere, the soil, and underground and sea waters on a global and a regional scale.

Why do these proposals not elicit reciprocal actions on the Potomac? The answer is clear. Washington did not and does not want to stop nuclear tests, and it covers up its reluctance with disinformation campaigns like the last one. And yet the preamble to the Moscow treaty states that the signatory countries will seek to end all nuclear tests for all time. The United States demonstrated its attitude to that pledge at the time of the Soviet moratorium. We gave up waiting for reciprocal quiet on the U.S. test sites. Our moratorium was wrecked, and the United States was to blame for that. But we reaffirm that we are ready to begin talks without delay on banning nuclear tests. To this end the Soviet side, in coauthorship with other socialist countries, submitted the document "Basic Provisions of a Treaty on the Total Prohibition of Nuclear Weapon Tests" for examination by the disarmament conference. The ball is in the U.S. court, as the saying goes.

Meteorology Chief on Fallout Check

LD171311 Moscow TASS in English 1303 GMT 17 Aug 87

[Text] Moscow August 17 TASS -- "The nuclear explosion carried out by the Soviet Union on Novaya Zemlya Island on August 2 did not become a breach of the 1963 Moscow treaty", said Yuriy Izrael, chairman of the State Committee for Hydrometeorology and Monitoring the Environment.

He spoke at a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists at the Press Centre of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs today.

"During underground nuclear explosions, volatile products, mainly the isotopes of noble radioactive gases, penetrate the atmosphere some time afterwards and may be scattered by winds to various distances, including the territories of other countries. Gaseous iodine products sometimes join the isotopes. But they did not lead to radioactive fallout."

"On August 2, a small amount of gaseous radioactive products leaked into the atmosphere but that, and this is of fundamental importance, did not lead to the formation of radioactive fallout and, consequently, did not result in a breach of the Moscow treaty of 1963".

"A plane made flights along the Soviet Union's northern borders adjoining Scandinavia for several days in succession -- after August 2 and till August 7 -- with a view to measuring transborder fluxes of ordinary chemical substances, and radioactivity. The plane did not record any increases in radioactivity".

"We analyzed very thoroughly the meteorological situation at the test range on Novaya Zemlya Island and a possibility of travel of even very small portions of radiation in the direction of Scandinavia".

"The meteorological situation was characterised by the presence of anticyclonic crest, at the centre of which there was a small cyclone with easterly and south-easterly wind".

"A calm weather predominated, on the whole, in the test area. So, radioactive products, according to data we have available, did not travel in the direction of Scandinavia".

"In pure theory," Yuriy Izrael went on to say, "one can assume that a small portion of air masses with gaseous radioactive products -- in an amount posing no hazard to the population -- could get to the territory of Scandinavia".

"This could be a very small amount and, as was reported by the Swedish and Norwegian press, in particular, it constituted one-thousandth of becquerel per cubic metre. This is smaller by a factor of 100,000 than the amount which was detected in the area of Finland, for example, during the Chernobyl accident, a smaller by a factor of 1,000 than the background content of natural radon in the atmosphere over land, over Sweden, in particular".

"In our days, with the existence of up-to-date equipment, it is possible to detect an amount of radioactive products at any point on the globe".

"If one shows concern over the appearance of such an insignificant amount of radioactive products", Yuriy Izrael said, "the most constructive way to solve the problem would be to end the tests of nuclear weapons, including underground ones".

"In this connection it is appropriate to recall that the Soviet side has repeatedly reaffirmed and is reaffirming its proposal immediately to begin talks on general and complete ban on the tests of nuclear weapons. As is known, the Soviet side is not to blame for the delay concerning this issue".

Foreign Ministry Press Briefing

PM181225 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Aug 87 Morning Edition p 4

[S. Guk report under the rubric "At the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center":
"'Selective' Radioactivity; Once More Concerning the Consequences of the
Underground Nuclear Explosion on Novaya Zemlya"]

[Text] This is the background to issue: The USSR conducted an underground nuclear explosion on the Novaya Zemlya Island 2 August. An insignificant rise in the level of radioactivity in the atmosphere was observed 9 days later in Sweden and other Scandinavian countries. The Western media immediately raised a hue and cry: Moscow, they say, is threatening the health of millions of people.

A briefing on Monday at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center was devoted to this event. Yu.A. Izrael, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Hydrometeorology and Environmental Control; G.I. Gerasimov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration; and B.G. Mayorskiy, deputy chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry department on questions of the peaceful use of nuclear energy and space, briefed journalists in detail on how the situation developed in the aforementioned region after the underground explosion.

In the West it has long been the tradition to assert that radioactive winds blow only from the east. In this particular instance no one, for example, has said a word about the fact that 10 August there was an accident at a nuclear power station in Britain -- a day before the insignificant rise in radioactivity in Sweden was noticed. They pretended that it has not taken place.

After the underground test 2 August, Yu.A. Izrael said, a negligible amount of gas did indeed rise to the surface. This did not occur because of "omissions" or "negligence": Such phenomena occur in any underground explosion, whether in the USSR or the United States. However thick the earth's crust, it is impossible to create a 100-percent hermetic seal. And this amount is negligible because it did not lead to radioactive fallout.

There is in the USSR a system of strict monitoring [kontrol] of the environment after underground nuclear tests are conducted. This was also conducted on this occasion. From 2 through 7 August a special aircraft patrolled the Soviet borders with Scandinavia and did not observe the slightest rise in radioactivity.

One more fact: The level of radioactivity in Sweden produced by natural radon background varies between 1-2 becquerels, and on 11 August this level rose by one-thousandth of a becquerel. Scandinavian scientists themselves think this is not worth mentioning. An insignificant quantity of radioactive products can be detected in any part of the world today.

The USSR, G.I. Gerasimov stressed, as before is ready to stop all nuclear explosions not only to "slam on the brakes" of the nuclear arms race but also to make the natural environment in which we live safe. The United States, which does not even want to hear of this, today more than anybody is whipping up passions and speculating on people's natural misgivings for their health.

At the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, B.G. Mayorskiy added, we placed on the negotiating table proposals to set up a system of global verification using space means (not only of underground tests but also the degree of contamination of water, the atmosphere, and the soil). The United States again opposed this...

IZVESTIYA's question to Yu.A. Izrael:

Was any rise in radioactivity observed in the atmosphere of the USSR's northern regions?

Reply: With the exception of Novaya Zemlya, no, it was not registered anywhere. I state this with the utmost responsibility: Our monitoring [kontrol] is very strict.

So, some radioactivity is selective: the area just east of and just west of the Soviet borders...

/8309

CSO: 5200/1631

NUCLEAR TESTING, FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

EUROPEANS BLAME SOVIET TEST FOR HIGHER RADIOACTIVITY

FRG Health Ministry Reports

LD131227 Hamburg DPA in German 1029 GMT 13 Aug 87

[Excerpt] Bonn (DPA) -- According to the Federal Health Ministry, the slight increase in radioactivity in the air, registered by the Federal Physical and Technical Institute (PTB) in Braunschweig, can probably be attributed to the underground nuclear test carried out by the USSR on 2 August. The ministry said in Bonn today that during the evening of 11 August PTB registered radioactivity of 16 microbecquerels of Iodine-131 per cubic meter of air. In Sweden, the figure was 1,800 microbecquerels and in Norway 800 microbecquerels; the German authorities have been informed of this.

The Health Ministry stressed that there was no danger to the population, even from the higher levels measured in Sweden. [passage omitted]

Finland Levels 'Almost Normal'

LD131646 Helsinki Domestic Service in Finnish 1300 GMT 12 Aug 87

[Excerpts] The cause of increased radioactive levels in northern Finland has been confirmed as the failure of a nuclear test conducted in the Soviet Union. The underground nuclear test was carried out on 2 August in Novaya Zemlya. Radioactivity was at its highest during the night of 6-7 August, and it rose again during the night of 8-9 August. The highest radiation rating was, however, only 1.8 millibecquerels in one cubic meter of air, which is about 1/100,000 part of the highest ratings measured after the Chernobyl nuclear power station accident.

The other Nordic countries gave information on the higher levels yesterday and the day before yesterday, but in Finland the matter was clarified only this morning.

The radiation situation throughout the country at the moment is almost normal.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1631

NUCLEAR TESTING, FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

BRIEFS

TASS ON 13 AUGUST NEVADA TEST--New York August 13 TASS--The United States today carried out a new underground nuclear explosion at the Nevada test site. The blast was rated at 20 to 150 kilotons, the Department of Energy reported. This nuclear test code-named "Tahoka" was conducted for military purposes within the framework of the research underway at the Los Alamos laboratory, a key Pentagon centre to develop new weapons, including nuclear arms and those under the "Star Wars" programme. This is already the 11th officially announced U.S. nuclear test this year, UPI news agency points out. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1535 GMT 13 Aug 87] /8309

CSO: 5200/1631

PRAVDA'S KORIONOV ARGUES 'BANKRUPTCY' OF NUCLEAR DETERRENCE

PM051005 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Jul 87 First Edition p 4

[Political observer Vitaliy Korionov article: "'Mister X' and Nuclear Foolhardiness"]

[Text] "...Look at the USSR as a rival and not a partner in the political arena.... Oppose the Russians with invincible counterforce wherever they show signs of infringing the interests of a peaceful stable world"--These were the "directives" which appeared 40 years ago, in July 1947, in the U.S. journal FOREIGN AFFAIRS in an article under the headline "The Sources of Soviet Behavior."

Let us recall that time: Tens of millions of Soviet people were tackling the colossal work of eliminating the devastating consequences of Hitler's invasion. Hundreds of cities in Europe and Asia were in ruins. Millions of people hoped that the war, which had just ended, would be the last in history.

True, at that time many were already seriously alarmed by the fact that people across the ocean had begun to bandy about with ever increasing force the bug-bear of the "Soviet military danger." But only the most perspicacious realized that certain U.S. circles needed this slanderous myth as political and theoretical justification for the monstrous design of preparing war against the country which had saved the world from the fascist plague and, furthermore, from nuclear war. The article which appeared in FOREIGN AFFAIRS was highly opportune for these circles. For its author promoted the concept of "containing communism," which these circles immediately interpreted as a policy of "nuclear deterrence" or "nuclear intimidation [ustrasheniye]. THE NEW YORK TIMES even proclaimed its author "America's global planner."

However, a little time passed and unforeseen things happened to this "planner": He began to realize that there was an increasing lack of correspondence between the realities of the international situation and his directives. And the author of the aforementioned article--who was G. Kennan, then an adviser at the U.S. Embassy in Moscow concealed under the pseudonym "Mister X"--had to begin to review his position. The thought of unleashing a war against the Soviet Union, which had quickly eliminated the U.S. monopoly on the atom bomb, was becoming increasingly absurd. And Kennan himself wrote that he had begun

to look upon himself as a man who had unintentionally thrown a huge rock from the top of a cliff and was now watching helplessly as it dropped down into the valley, bringing destruction, and observing each new sign of catastrophe with horror and trepidation.

"Mister X" began to maintain that his concept had been interpreted as a call for military confrontation with the USSR, when in reality he was only talking about political and ideological confrontation. He stated: "I think I was wrong. Not in my analysis of the Soviet position but in my assumption that the U.S. Government has the capability to act politically in the sphere of foreign relations." But recently in an article devoted to the 40th anniversary of his sensational article the venerable diplomat stated quite definitely in the same journal: "What needs to be contained today is not the Soviet Union but the arms race itself."

However Kennan's conclusions were no longer of interest to the instigators of this race. Their aim was to justify the buildup of nuclear arms at any price. The doctrine of "nuclear deterrence" is advanced to achieve this. They are still waving this dilapidated banner today.

The only real way to defend peace, the British prime minister assures us, is the nuclear deterrence forces, which Britain intends to retain "at least until the end of the present millennium." And Sylvester Foley, U.S. assistant secretary of energy, expressing an opinion that is far from his alone, maintains: "One can expect that the testing and production of nuclear weapons will continue into the 21st century.

Devotees of nuclear weapons are enraged by the very thought that they could be outlawed. Richard Perle, who since his recent retirement from the Pentagon remains an adviser to the defense secretary, proclaimed the idea of transforming Europe into a nuclear-free continent "dangerous stupidity" and a "ridiculous whim." Congressman John Kemp, who is seeking nomination as a candidate for the presidency, called the possibility of an agreement with the USSR "a nuclear Munich." L. Hansen, defending the need for "nuclear deterrence," went so far as to maintain that the "problem of preventing nuclear war is in general not of primary significance." And this statement comes from the lips of one of the men representing the United States at the Geneva disarmament talks!

The authors of such statements resort to truly specious devices. Yes, nuclear weapons, they acknowledge, are of course an evil. But nuclear war is an even greater evil, and since the presence of nuclear weapons per se apparently prevents such a war being unleashed, one has to reconcile oneself to them as the lesser of the two evils. W. West, a physicist from the Livermore Laboratory, which works for the Pentagon, declared, for example: The latest means of destruction including space strike weapons will constitute ... "weapons for life!"

It must be obvious to every reasonable person that the more nuclear weapons there are in states' arsenals (according to data printed in the U.S. press, on average five new nuclear warheads are produced every day in the United States), the greater the probability of a fatal malfunction. Suffice it to recall that over the past 20 years more than 60 incidents of various types

involving nuclear weapons have been recorded in the U.S. Armed Forces. Fortunately, they have hitherto managed to avoid serious catastrophes, but who is to guarantee that this will be the case in the future? For as military equipment develops, the resolution of questions of war and peace is in effect being increasingly handed over to machines. This is precisely what the Pentagon is banking on. General Abrahamson, leader of the "star wars" program, says: "Currently we are relying on people's intelligence. In the future we would like to rely on our modern technology." It is obvious that the circles which he represents do not want to understand that "nuclear brinkmanship" constitutes an extremely slippery platform from which it is possible to plunge into the nuclear abyss at any moment.

Yet are the most bellicosely inclined U.S. circles endeavoring to prevent this danger? All the indications are to be contrary. A report published some time ago by the Union of Concerned Scientists points out that the "deterrence" slogan only serves as a cover for plans to create a structure of offensive forces which could enable the United States to "win" a nuclear war. "Deterrence," the report said, "is proclaimed to be the goal of U.S. strategy, but the requirements of deterrence are shaped in such a way as to be practically synonymous with seeking opportunities to wage and 'win' a nuclear war."

The conclusion is self-evident: The concept of "nuclear deterrence" does not reduce but rather heightens the possibility of military conflicts. And the probability of them occurring becomes even greater if nuclear weapons are put into space. You do not have to be a prophet to realize that the destabilization caused by such a train of events could result in a terrible crisis.

It remains to add that today the doctrine of "nuclear deterrence" is an indisputable braking factor in talks designed to halt the arms race--both bilateral and multilateral.

The Soviet Union resolutely rejects the most dangerous doctrine of "nuclear deterrence." It is persistently laying the foundations for a nuclear-free world. The realistic specific program proposed by our country to completely rid the planet of all types of nuclear weapon by the beginning of the next millenium is the main way to rid mankind of the threat of a nuclear apocalypse.

The new Soviet proposals to eliminate a whole class of nuclear weapons both in Europe and in Asia have met with a fervent response everywhere because peoples regard their implementation as the first practical step toward a breakthrough on the nuclear disarmament front, which has been obstructed for so many years by certain Washington circles. Now the possibility of such a breakthrough is more real than ever before. Taking advantage of it is an imperative demand of the time.

The complete bankruptcy of the concept of "nuclear deterrence" is particularly obvious in our time when the movement in favor of achieving a Soviet-U.S. agreement on medium-range and operational and tactical missiles is expanding throughout the world. The historic chance which is now opening up must not be missed--this is the unanimous demand of all those who hold a position of reason. Those who obstinately cling to yesterday's doctrines are in blatant opposition to today's.

"Mister X" did not need so much time to reach this conclusion: The concept of "nuclear deterrence" is destructive. When will this truth be grasped by all those people who stand at the helm of power in NATO countries? For time will not wait....

RELATED ISSUES

USSR: AUSTRALIA'S FOREIGN MINISTER PROPOSES RISK-REDUCTION MEASURES

LD181525 Moscow TASS in English 1446 GMT 18 Aug 87

[Text] Moscow August 18 TASS -- "Addressing the symposium in Canberra on the issue of security and arms control in the northern part of the Pacific, Australia's Minister for Foreign Affairs William Hayden proposed a number of measures to lessen the risk of war in the region. Most of them are, in essence, consonant with the ideas of strengthening military security in that region, which were put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev in an interview with the newspaper MERDEKA," Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry, told a briefing here today.

He said that the Australian minister for foreign affairs had named, in particular, such measures as a limitation, reduction and scrapping of strategic offensive weapons or nuclear weapons of a lesser range deployed in that region, limitations on the number and tonnage of warships, various versions of mutual separation for a safe distance from one another of the navies of the opposite sides and the creation of a nuclear-free zone.

The minister said that there are various ways to implement the ideas spelled out by him. But the first and most sensible step would be the holding of a direct dialogue between the two super-powers on the strategic appraisals of prospects for ensuring security in the northern Pacific.

"Moscow has treated with attention the stand set forth by William Hayden, since we proceed from the premise," Gennadiy Gerasimov stressed, "that the question of ensuring real security, lessening the levels of military confrontation and building up confidence in any region of the world concerns not only the USSR and the USA. There are tens of states in the Pacific region, which can and must make their contribution to that cause. [quotation marks as received]

/8309

CSO: 5200/1632

MONGOLIAN LEADER ESPOUSES ASIAN SECURITY

Prague WORLD MARXIST REVIEW in English No 6, Jun 87 pp 5-12

[Article by Zhambyn Batmunkh, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party and Chairman of the Great People's Hural Presidium: "Security in Asia: A Common Concern"]

[Text]

GREAT historical developments and changes have taken place in our epoch in Asia and the Pacific region, where most of the world's people live. It was a majority left out of historical progress, but in the early twentieth century it ceased to play a passive role. Under the influence of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the peoples began to storm the colonial bastion of the imperialist powers in the region, which collapsed as a result of the rout of the forces of fascism and militarism in World War II and the powerful onslaught of the national liberation movement. The dozens of newly independent states strove to overcome the legacy of the past in a brief historical period.

The peoples of the newly liberated countries of Asia and the Pacific, big and small, have enriched the world with their diverse and original experience in their fight for freedom, independence and social progress, and have achieved tangible changes in economic and social development. But these states still have greatly differing economic development levels and political, social, cultural and religious institutions and traditions, a situation which requires a realistic approach to their specific conditions.

The socialist states of Asia are a growing force. Their efforts to overcome their difficulties and trials produced by external and internal factors have demonstrated the viability of the ideas of scientific socialism in the struggle for national and social gains. These countries have worked for purposeful and balanced development of the economy and living and cultural standards, and for a peaceful international situation. The policy of

Zhambyn Batmunkh (b. 1926) has been a member of the MPRP since 1948; from 1951 to 1973 he was a lecturer, a pro-rector of the Higher Party School under the MPRP CC, and rector of the Mongolian State University. In 1973 he was department head at the MPRP CC; in 1971, he was elected CC alternate member, in 1974 CC member and a member of the CC Political Bureau. From 1974 to 1984, he was chairman of the Council of Ministers, and since 1984, has been CC General Secretary and Chairman of the Presidium of Mongolia's Great People's Hural.

the Soviet Union and the other socialist states, with its abiding concern for general security and stronger positions for the forces of peace and national liberation in the Asian-Pacific region and throughout the world, is in step with the historical processes. It is based on Lenin's far-sighted view, who wrote: "The period of the awakening of the East in the contemporary revolution is being succeeded by a period in which all the Eastern peoples will participate in deciding the destiny of the whole world, so as not to be simply objects of enrichment of others. The peoples of the East are becoming alive to the need for practical action, the need for every nation to take part in shaping the destiny of all mankind."

Despite their distinctions, the Asian-Pacific states have gained valuable experience in building bilateral and multilateral relations on the basis of good-neighbourhood, cooperation and mutual security. They have produced such important political and juridical principles of relations between states with different social systems, as Pancha sheel, the five principles of peaceful coexistence, and the ten principles of the Bandung Conference. The conception of non-alignment emerged on our continent, where it took its first steps. It became the basis for the influential movement which now involves more than 100 countries, and which has an important positive role in the international arena.

The arrangement and balance of political forces on the Asian continent, as on the whole globe, have undergone profound changes over the last few decades in favour of the forces of peace, democracy and socialism, a reality which the reactionary circles of the United States and other imperialist powers refuse to recognise to this day. As soon as World War II ended, they took a bellicose attitude and conducted a policy of confrontation from strength with respect to the socialist countries and of suppression of national liberation movements, including outright armed intervention. In consequence, the peoples of Asia have suffered many sharp and often extremely dangerous armed conflicts.

Up to now nuclear weapons have been used twice: both times by the United States in Asia. The A-bombings incinerated hundreds of thousands of people in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The overt armed aggression against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea were an extreme manifestation of the imperialist strength policy. The world knows of the brutal methods that were used in the course of both aggressions.

Imperialism suffered one defeat after another in the face of the Asian people's courageous resistance. It was forced to accept an armistice in Korea in 1953, the Geneva Conference on Indochina in 1954, and the 1973 Paris Accords on Vietnam. The Vietnamese people's victory and the formation of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, together with the triumph of the peoples' revolutions in Laos and Kampuchea, were events of outstanding importance. They did much to stabilise the military-political situation in Southeast Asia.

The growing independence of the Asian countries in solving international problems and ensuring their own security, and the emergence and development of the non-aligned movement dealt a crushing blow at the bloc policy of imperialism. Its military-political alliances, CENTO and

SEATO, fell apart one by one. The imperialist policy of discrimination against some sovereign states, including the Mongolian People's Republic, collapsed, and they have long since taken their rightful place in the United Nations.

Thus, neither the numerous moves by the imperialist states, led by the United States, nor their armed gambles managed to halt the advance of the forces of progress and liberation in the Asian-Pacific region, and that forced Washington to seek new ways of attaining its strategic objectives. That is evidenced by the adoption in the mid-1970s of the New Pacific Doctrine by the United States, which regards the whole region as a sphere of its 'vital interests'. Strengthening the US military presence, allegedly to ensure a stable balance of forces in the region, became its prime objective.

Partnership with Japan and close ties with the Seoul regime are key elements of the doctrine. The fact that dozens of US military bases, manned by large armed contingents, are now located on the Japanese islands and in South Korea is a matter of profound concern for the peoples of the Asian and Pacific region. US warships with nuclear weapons on board keep entering ports in the two countries, while US nuclear-armed aircraft are either temporarily or permanently deployed on their soil.

Japan is being intensively rearmed in breach of the Japanese Constitution, which renounces war as a means of settling international issues and the build-up of any type of armed forces. The country's conversion into a US nuclear bridgehead is in contradiction of the commitment not to have, make, or import nuclear weapons on its territory.

The United States has kept building up its military bases and armaments in the south of the Korean Peninsula. The Reagan administration's recent decision to deploy US ground-based short-range missiles in South Korea was yet another dangerous step in stockpiling nuclear-missile arsenals, which pose a threat to all the countries in the region.

US reactionary circles have been knocking together the militaristic Washington-Tokyo-Seoul axis as the core of an 'Eastern front' in the fight against the socialist countries and the forces of national liberation and progress. The United States has been trying to enlarge the vast ring of its military bases round Asia, which runs from the Persian Gulf to Micronesia, by building up new bridgeheads and strongpoints for its rapid deployment force, which is a force for aggression and intervention.

The attempt by US militarism to involve Asian-Pacific countries in Reagan's SDI poses an especial threat to security and stability in the region. For that purpose, the United States has not only stepped up the construction of 'star wars'-related installations at the approaches to our continent, but wants Japan to take part in technological projects under the SDI programme. Claims by US propaganda that SDI would make nuclear weapons 'meaningless and obsolete' and that it would be a gain for Asian security are a malicious attempt to deceive public opinion.

The Western powers, the United States in the first place, have been giving many less developed countries in Asia and the Pacific what they call military aid, which amounts to the sale of weapons and start-up of their production so as to involve these countries in the arms race. That is having a ruinous effect on the economy of the newly independent nations and

diverting a great part of their scant resources from the solution of burning economic and social problems. US military aid is being used for direct political pressure on LDC governments so as to draw them into the sphere of US great-power schemes to turn the ASEAN, for instance — regional economic and political alliance — into a military alliance.

It is a part of the neoglobalist policy of imperialism, which was proclaimed by President Reagan, to inflate an atmosphere of mutual mistrust in the region, to provoke diverse territorial and border disputes, and to fan conflicts. This policy is exemplified by the undeclared war against Afghanistan and Kampuchea.

The prime cause of the growing tensions and divisions in the Asian-Pacific region is, therefore, perfectly obvious. It is now an arena of acute and sharpening contradictions both between the two opposite systems — the socialist and the capitalist — and between the neocolonialist policy and peoples' will for independence and progress. *Big Stick attempts by imperialist reaction to resolve these contradictions, neoglobalist ambitions and the urge for domination based on military might explain why our region has become one of the most explosive in the world.* Imperialism has tried to keep the region within its sphere of influence with the use of both the old methods of colonial brigandism and the subtler methods of neocolonialist oppression and plunder, and has ignored the legitimate interests and aspirations of its peoples.

The mounting instability in this vast and important region is also connected with the contradictory political, military and economic interests of the imperialist powers, such as the ever-more acute rivalry between US, Japanese and West European monopolies in the region.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries have countered the imperialist policy of aggression and mounting tension with their *policy of détente, stronger peace and security for the peoples of our region.*

The fraternal socialist countries' relations with the non-socialist countries are based on mutual respect, equality, peaceful coexistence and non-interference in each other's internal affairs. The spirit of the new political thinking pervades the Soviet Union's recent initiatives for a general and complex solution to the problems of détente and disarmament, a more vigorous collective quest for ways of defusing situations of conflict, and developing mutually advantageous cooperation between all the countries of the Asian-Pacific region.

In the present international situation, which is marked by growing mass awareness of the need for peace for all nations and peoples, the socialist countries have actively sought *new and non-standard approaches to the security of individual countries and regional and global security.* The new thinking on these issues is exemplified by the USSR's foreign policy strategy as formulated by the 27th Congress of the CPSU, and the initiatives on disarmament within the framework of this strategy. The Soviet programme for a nuclear-free world through the liquidation of all weapons of mass destruction by the end of the century is *the key to solving the basic problems of international politics*, and it was most fully reflected in the July 1986 Vladivostok speech by CPSU CC General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachov, when he elaborated various ideas on the development of

peaceful cooperation between countries in the region. The idea of joining their efforts to seek ways to security and stability and cooperation has met with wide support by public opinion and states in the region.

The Delhi Declaration on the Principles of a Nuclear-Weapon-Free and Non-Violent World signed by the leaders of two great countries — India and the Soviet Union — was the next major step after Vladivostok in consolidating the regional and global peace process. The propositions formulated in the document, which are of worldwide significance, provide the moral and political basis for a lasting peace on our globe. The Delhi Declaration stressed that fear and suspicion must give way to mutual understanding and trust, and that the 'equilibrium of fear' in politics should give way to a comprehensive international security system.

Mikhail Gorbachov's statement of February 28, 1987, contained an important Soviet initiative on removing medium-range missiles from Europe over the next five years, with the number of this class of missiles reduced in the Asian part of the Soviet Union down to 100 warheads within the same period, provided the United States retains the same number of medium-range missile warheads on its national territory. This proposal is, therefore, of cardinal significance not only for European security, but also for security in the Asian-Pacific region and the whole world. We whole-heartedly approve and support that initiative, and the new ideas on disarmament which Mikhail Gorbachov spelled out in his April speech in Prague.

Let us recall that the Soviet Union has expressed its readiness to provide contractual guarantees that it will not use nuclear weapons against nuclear-free-status countries. A similar stand has been taken by China, which has followed the USSR in committing itself not to use nuclear weapons first, and has come out against the militarisation of space, and for a ban on nuclear, chemical and biological weapons.

We also believe that the Soviet proposals on ending all nuclear testing in the Pacific, reducing the activity of navies in the region, above all the ships armed with nuclear weapons, and radical cuts in armed forces and conventional armaments in our region are also most timely. Implementation of these initiatives would stimulate the elaboration and implementation of additional measures of trust in the military sphere which are so necessary in Asia and the adjacent oceans.

In our view, the USSR's proposal to convene a conference of all the Pacific Ocean countries, similar to the Helsinki Conference in Europe, is also informed by the new and complex approach to the realities. Sceptics and those who oppose the idea claim that Europe's experience cannot be applied to our region because it is geographically far-flung, because of the national prejudices and religious strife between its peoples and the existence of a tight knot of other difficult problems. But let us recall that the road to the Helsinki Conference was not well-paved at all. However, those who took part in it succeeded in advancing along that road and overcoming the difficulties springing from different social systems, political orientations, ideological and religious convictions, and membership of opposite military blocs.

Borrowing from that experience does not, of course, mean mechanically

transferring the Helsinki scheme to Asian soil. The point is to make purposeful and creative use of the key elements of European détente which have stood the test of practice, the principal right of the peoples, the right to decide on their own future, respect for national independence and sovereignty, inviolability of borders, and territorial integrity, non-interference in internal affairs, peaceful settlement of regional conflicts and disputes, and development of equitable and mutually advantageous cooperation. Let us bear in mind that many of these provisions are already contained in the Pancha sheel and Bandung principles.

They could be used, for instance, for a political settlement of the situation in Southeast Asia. Mongolia has consistently supported the programme for turning it into a region of peace, good neighbourhood and cooperation, which was proposed by Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea. Their approach is principled and flexible, and shows an urge for reasonable compromise. The three countries of Indochina have agreed that all the Vietnamese volunteers are to be withdrawn from Kampuchea by 1990. They want a political dialogue for a fair solution of the Kampuchean problem, naturally without the participation of the blood-covered Pol Pot clique. This can be done only on the basis of recognition of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, a reality of international life.

The regular consultations between the USSR and China on normalising their relations are of great significance for improving the political atmosphere on the Asian continent. Our stand on Mongolian-Chinese relations is concrete and clear-cut. We have always conducted a consistent course aimed to develop ties with China on the basis of the generally recognised principles of good neighbourhood. Such ties would meet the interests of the Mongolian and the Chinese people, and of peace and socialism. The same is true of Vietnamese-Chinese relations. Vietnam has long proposed negotiations with China — at any time, at any level — reasonably regarding these as an important factor in stabilising the situation in Southeast Asia.

Elimination of the long-standing and dangerous hotbeds of tension, such as that in the south of the Korean Peninsula, is an organic element of the efforts to ensure regional security. We have always voiced solidarity and complete support for the proposals of DPRK to turn the peninsula into an area of peace through a withdrawal of the US forces and armaments, notably nuclear weapons, and a replacement of the armistice agreement with a peace treaty and a wide-ranging dialogue between the North and the South. That would help to create a favourable situation for the unification of Korea on a peaceful and democratic basis.

International public opinion is ever more aware of the true state of things in Afghanistan, whose people have got down to progressive transformations and have actively supported the Afghan leadership's policy of national reconciliation. The Afghans have good ground to regard the policy as the only true way of ending the fratricidal war, which is being fanned by external forces. The withdrawal from the country of six Soviet regiments, the agreement on the deadlines for the phased return of the temporarily remaining Soviet units, and the measures for expanding the social basis of the April Revolution are telling evidence of the urge on the

part of the USSR and the DRA to have a peaceful settlement of the conflict.

Mongolia has been doing much to strengthen peace and security, mutual understanding and cooperation in the region. A concrete expression of these efforts was its 1981 proposal for a convention on mutual non-aggression and non-resort to force in interstate relations. We called for a regional conference to work out the provisions of a convention and other related issues by the countries concerned, an idea which was supported by the fraternal socialist countries, many peaceable states, and by public opinion, and which is still on the agenda.

The Soviet and Mongolian governments displayed good will and a desire to promote détente in Asia when they agreed on the withdrawal from Mongolia of a sizeable part of the Soviet troops temporarily stationed in the area. That has been done.

India, a recognised leader of the non-aligned movement, has been making a tangible contribution to seeking ways for improving the situation on the Asian continent and in the Indian Ocean area. It has consistently conducted a policy of reducing tensions, developing good neighbour relations with the countries of the region, and seeking the implementation of the 1971 UN Declaration on turning the Indian Ocean into an area of peace.

More and more states in the region have supported the idea of non-nuclear zones in the face of the growing militaristic preparations by imperialism: 13 countries in the South Pacific have concluded a treaty — the Rarotonga Treaty — declaring the area free from nuclear weapons. Its protocols have been signed by the Soviet Union and China. ASEAN members have agreed to work out a conception for establishing a nuclear-free zone in Southeast Asia. There is a spreading Japanese public movement for removing US nuclear bases from the country and declaring the prefectures and cities nuclear-weapon-free areas. *In this way, the constructive initiatives and efforts of the socialist and other peace-loving states to ensure security are translated into practice.*

The interests of peaceful development require mutually advantageous cooperation, ruling out any economic, commercial scientific and technical discrimination between all the countries in the region, and restructuring of the existing system of international economic relations on fair and democratic principles. Asia and the oceans around it have great and still untapped economic resources and natural wealth, which can be rationally used to advance the peoples of our region and mankind as a whole. The socialist states have been doing much to solve this problem.

The Soviet Union's proposal for extending cooperation on the development of the productive forces, training of personnel, use of new sources of energy, exchanges of scientific and technical information, steps for environmental protection and rational use of natural resources, and efforts to overcome the effects of natural disasters has been seen in the region as a valuable initiative to improve the international situation and ensure economic security. Any of these problems bears on these countries' vital interests which need to be combined, instead of being contrasted with each other. Effective solution of these problems is most important and

implies serious collective efforts.

Contacts and ties in humanitarian areas — culture, sport, tourist travel, and others — would also help to strengthen mutual understanding, trust and accord between the peoples of our region.

The Asian-Pacific region is now going through a period of revival, which has a vast potential for progress. Its role in world politics and economy has been steadily growing, and *it can and must be peaceful, constructive and creative*. No other course of development can be allowed, for the military threat has been exacerbated to the utmost.

Asia now has an especial need of political settlement of its problems and a halt to military preparations and the arms race. Ensuring security on the continent on the basis of a well-considered and generally acceptable conception is a long-term task. The earlier the peoples of the region get down to its fulfilment, the sooner peace and prosperity will be established on the vast expanses of Asia and the Pacific. That is the task which needs to be tackled step by step, in a movement from the simple to the complex. That is why we attach such importance to the idea put forward at the Soviet-Indian talks of *establishing step by step an Asian security system by normalising the political situation, and creating an atmosphere of trust and cooperation on bilateral and multilateral interstate level*. An international conference could have an important role to play in this matter. All of that also requires joint efforts by the public peace forces, which have been most active in the region over the past few years.

Numerous national and international acts in support of the idea of Asian security have been staged, including action by broad public opinion, members of parliament, and realistically-minded political leaders. *That being so, the Communists in the Asian-Pacific region countries feel the need to exchange views on how to make their actions more potent*. Mongolia has met the wish of a number of fraternal parties in acting as coordinator for a consultative meeting of representatives of communist and workers' parties in Ulan Bator in July of this year to discuss the problems with which they are concerned.

We shall do everything we can to make the meeting — and it is open to all the Communists of the region — a successful one and a valuable contribution to the strengthening of peace, security and good neighbour cooperation.

¹ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p.160.

² *Ibid.*

/8309

CSO: 5200/1632

USSR: MONGOLIA'S FOREIGN MINISTER HAILS GORBACHEV ASIA POLICY

PM191505 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Aug 87 Second Edition p 4

[Article by Mongolian Foreign Minister M. Dugersuren: "In the Spirit of New Thinking. The Asia and Pacific Region: Ways to Ensure Mutual Understanding, Security, and Peace"]

[Text] Ulaanbaatar -- Just over a year has elapsed since M.S. Gorbachev set forth the Soviet program for creating the foundations of all-embracing security and cooperation in Asia and the Pacific basin through the common efforts of all states in the region. On the basis of an in-depth scientific analysis of international relations -- their present state and prospects -- his speech formulated the constructive concept of strengthening peace in this vast region and proposed practical measures to implement it. M.S. Gorbachev's replies to the Indonesian newspaper MERDEKA further developed and expanded the Vladivostok program both through concepts and through specific practical steps.

In accordance with the line of the 27th CPSU Congress, measures to deliver mankind from the nuclear threat constitute the basis of these initiatives. Countering the imperialist course of diktat and neoglobalism and the militarist policy of nuclear deterrence, they are aimed at asserting the principles of peaceful coexistence as the universal norm of international relations and indicate ways for the countries and peoples of the region to switch to active cooperation in the name of strengthening universal security and peaceful cooperation.

The ideas efficiently using the region's growing economic might in the interests of peace and development are closely linked with this. This might is really tremendous. By the start of the 21st century the USSR will have doubled its economic potential on a qualitatively higher scientific and technical level. The PRC Government's plans to accelerate rates of economic development are well known. The other socialist countries of the region will make significant advances in this sphere. The United States, Japan, India, the so-called "new industrial states," and the ASEAN countries will take further steps forward.

We have witnessed many events and trends which clearly point to progress along the path of realizing the ideas of Vladivostok. These are the results of multifaceted vigorous actions by the USSR, other socialist countries, and all peace-loving forces.

Mention should be made of the opportunity which has appeared of reaching an agreement on the question of eliminating the Soviet and U.S. medium-range and operational and tactical missiles. This opportunity has become still more real thanks to the new Soviet proposals with regard to a "global double zero." This constructive and bold

step confirms the consistency of the USSR policy aimed at destroying an entire class of nuclear missile means and creates a qualitatively new atmosphere at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms. The speech by USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze at the Geneva Disarmament Conference has expanded still further the practical aspects of the Soviet program for the elimination of means of mass destruction. [paragraph continues]

The implementation of the USSR's new initiatives, Comrade J. Batmonh recently pointed out at an MPRP Central Committee Politburo session, would undoubtedly not only help to strengthen the security of the states of the region and promote a universal desire to achieve a nuclear-free world but would also lessen tension, mistrust, and the danger of new conflicts arising and render safe the sea and air routes and lines of communication over the vast expanses of the Pacific and the Indian Ocean.

If the West overcomes its ingrained negativism and finally accepts the Soviet proposals, a spurt will be made in the cause of nuclear disarmament. Naturally, such an event will have a very direct impact on the strengthening of peace and security in our region.

The Soviet-Indian Declaration on the Principles of a Nuclear-Weapon-Free and Nonviolent World was a major political step on the way to advancing the ideas of Vladivostok and new political thinking. That historic document possesses great political and moral authority. It combines the humane principles of international policy to which the two great forces of modern times -- socialism and the national liberation movement -- adhere.

A significant event last year was the validation of the Rarotonga Treaty, which consolidated the process of turning the South Pacific into a nuclear-free zone. The fact that the Soviet Union and the PRC have signed the corresponding protocols to it has also been met with broad approval. The movement for turning regions such as the Korean peninsula, Southeast Asia, and the Indian Ocean into zones free from nuclear weapons has become more active.

The recent withdrawal from Afghanistan and Mongolia of a number of units of the limited contingents of Soviet troops temporarily stationed in these countries at their governments' request also serves to improve the international climate and to strengthen trust. Despite increased subversive actions by the United States and certain of its NATO and regional accomplices, the process of national reconciliation is successfully being implemented in Afghanistan, and its government's efforts to achieve a political settlement and normalize the situation are meeting with ever greater support.

Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos have imparted new impetus to their efforts aimed at improving relations with the PRC and the ASEAN countries, to turn Southeast Asia into a region of peace, stability, and cooperation. Thanks to the realistic and flexible stand of the PRK Government and the socialist states of Indochina, positive trends may be seen in the question of settling in a spirit of national reconciliation the situation which has been created around Cambodia.

The DPRK has advanced a number of new initiatives aimed at eliminating tension on the Korean peninsula and in the Far East, setting up a high-level North-South dialogue, and thereby preparing the preconditions for Korea's peaceful unification.

The further improvement of relations between the USSR and the PRC in the political, economic, cultural, and other spheres is of great significance for improving the international situation.

During the year since the Vladivostok speech the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries of Asia have considerably broadened contacts with many countries of the region through various channels and raised the level of political dialogue. They are activating cooperation within the framework of the UN ESCAP and trying to enhance the efficiency of this intergovernmental organization's work.

The consultative meeting of representatives of communist and revolutionary democratic parties held in Ulaanbaatar at the beginning of July attests to the activation of the progressive public in the Asia and Pacific region countries. There was a lively exchange of opinions on problems of the struggle for peace, security, and good-neighborly cooperation -- an exchange imbued with the spirit of fraternal solidarity. The participants in this first broadly representative meeting of this nature in our region rated highly the significance of the Vladivostok program for strengthening the antiwar and antinuclear movement and outlined ways to mobilize the public in the struggle for peace.

The danger hanging over mankind is not diminishing, however. The situation in the Asia and Pacific region is also being exacerbated. Militarist and revanchist circles are seeking to turn this part of the planet into a new bridgehead of aggression against socialist countries and national liberation movements. U.S. first-strike nuclear missile means are being built up here on land, at sea, and under water. The alliance of U.S. and Japanese military-monopolist forces under the "Star Wars" program has become a dangerous component of the plans for the militarization of space.

Imperialists try to destabilize the situation in progressive and peace-loving states, interfere in their internal affairs, and frequently resort to the use of force through the agency of reactionary regimes. Many countries of the region are increasingly being drawn into the arms race.

Monopolies of the United States, Japan, and other capitalist powers are seeking deeper economic, political, and ideological penetration of the countries of the region. They are sowing anticommunist and anti-Soviet prejudices and fanning mistrust and enmity among peoples.

The situation which has taken shape requires vigorous actions to implement the policy of peace and international cooperation with utilization of all the positive factors and all the positive traditions of the anti-imperialist and anticolonial struggle of the peoples of the region. Let us recall that it was as far back as during the "cold war" period that the 5 principles of peaceful coexistence ("panch shila") and the 10 principles of Bandung were proclaimed in Asia and that the Nonaligned Movement was begun. Is this not an aktiv of fighters for peace and cooperation!

Now that the question of the future of our civilization is on the agenda, maximum use must be made of the human factor and of the force of reason to create a reliable system of security equal for all countries and peoples -- large and small.

Socialist countries proceed from the truth that mankind has real potential for rebuffing the adventurist policy of nuclear deterrence, strong-arm pressure, and neoglobalism. Their growing material potential and political influence serve this. We are convinced that the processes of restructuring now taking place in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and the struggle for the all-around acceleration of socialist building will still further strengthen the material guarantee of world peace and security.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1632

RELATED ISSUES

USSR: PRK FOREIGN MINISTER VIEWS ASIAN SECURITY ISSUES

PM131531 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Aug 87 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview with PRK Foreign Minister Kong Korm by IZVESTIYA correspondent B. Vinogradov in Phnom Penh: "Cambodia: Peace and Stability Are the Main Objective"--no date of interview given; first paragraph is IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Excerpts] PRK Foreign Minister Kong Korm gave an interview to IZVESTIYA correspondent B. Vinogradov on questions concerning the main directions of the country's foreign policy course.

The PRK Government, the minister said, consistently advocates normalization of the situation in Southeast Asia, making its contribution toward transforming this region into a zone of peace, good-neighborliness, and cooperation. Our country's peace-loving course has won it the international public's growing respect. Successfully countering the gross encroachments on Cambodia's vital interests by reactionary forces, our people are strengthening in every way the relations of friendship and cooperation with Vietnam, the Soviet Union, Laos, the other fraternal socialist countries, and all peace-loving states in the world.

We ardently support the Delhi Declaration calling for struggle for a world free from nuclear weapons and violence, as well as the Soviet Union's idea of creating an all-embracing collective security system in the Asian and Pacific region, put forward by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in Vladivostok. The need to solve questions of a regional settlement is one of the main avenues of progress toward this most important goal. This part of the suggested program directly affects Cambodia.

In today's international situation, Kong Korm went on to note, particular importance attaches to further rallying all peace-loving forces, the immediate activation of their efforts in the struggle to eliminate the threat of nuclear war, strengthening international security, and guaranteeing the peoples' right to self-determination, independence, and social progress.

During the visit by USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze to Cambodia we expressed belief that the implementation of the Soviet initiatives on fundamental problems of disarmament would result in substantial positive changes in the situation all over the world and would free mankind from the threat of nuclear and chemical annihilation.

Our government also welcomes and supports the USSR's new initiatives, which constitute a further development of the Far East program of struggle for peace and security on the basis of joint efforts by all states situated in the Asian and Pacific region. There is no doubt that the implementation of these proposals would lay permanent foundations for the maintenance of peace and cooperation between peoples. We perceive the policy of national reconciliation proclaimed by the PRK Government as our contribution toward the implementation of this program.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1632

RELATED ISSUES

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA CITES PRC VIEWS ON KOREAN TROOP CUTS .

PM191514 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 19 Aug 87 First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Yang Dezhi Statement"]

[Text] Beijing, 18 Aug -- China resolutely supports the just position of the Korean people, who advocate the peaceful, autonomous reunification of their motherland. This was stated here by Yang Dezhi, member of the CPC Central Committee Politburo and chief of General Staff of the Chinese People's Liberation Army, during a meeting with a Korean People's Army delegation headed by Chief of General Staff O Kuk-yol.

Yang Dezhi stressed that China assesses highly the recent DPRK Government decision to reduce its troop numbers by 100,000, and also its proposal to the United States and South Korean on a phased reduction in the troops deployed in North and South Korea and the withdrawal of foreign troops from the Korean peninsula.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1632

END

10

This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, economic, military, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available source; it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated. Those from English-language sources are transcribed, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names which are rendered phonetically or transliterated by FBIS/JPRS are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source.

SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in 8 volumes: China, East Europe, Soviet Union, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Africa (Sub-Sahara), Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTs may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically. Current JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcovers or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. DOD consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate

command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.) For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (703) 527-2368, or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

Both the DAILY REPORTs and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.